arXiv:1202.4007v1 [q-fin.PR] 17 Feb 2012

UTILITY-BASED PRICING IN THE LARGE POSITION, NEARLY COMPLETE LIMIT

SCOTT ROBERTSON
CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Abstract. This paper provides approximations to utility indifference prices for a contingent claim in the large position size limit. Results are valid for general utility functions and semi-martingale models. It is shown that as the position size approaches infinity, all utility functions with the same rate of decay for large negative wealths yield the same price. Practically, this means an investor should price like an exponential investor. In a sizeable class of diffusion models, the large position limit is seen to arise naturally in conjuction with the limit of a complete model and hence approximations are most appropriate in this setting.

1. Introduction

The problem of pricing contingent claims in incomplete markets is classic in Mathematical Finance. In contrast to the case of complete markets where perfect replication is possible, in the incomplete setting arbitrage arguments alone typically yield a range of fair prices for a given claim. Furthermore, as specific examples show (see Section 4.3), this range can be maximal in that it coincides with the set of all possible values the claim may take. Therefore, the definition of the "price" for a claim must be altered in a manner to incorporate some criterion other than simply precluding arbitrage opportunities.

The theory of utility maximization provides a way to price contingent claims which incorporates investor preferences. There are essentially three types of utility-based prices : indifference prices, obtained by balancing owning and not owning the claim; marginal prices, found by asking why a given position size is optimal; and prices obtained via expectations according to the pricing (or martingale) measure optimal for the dual utility maximization problem. In the complete setting, these three prices collapse to a singleton but in the incomplete setting they may all yield different values. In this article, indifference prices are considered. The idea behind indifference pricing traces back to Hodges and Neuberger [1989] and the topic has been studied by many authors : see Carmona [2009] for a comprehensive review and Section 2 for a number of references relevant to this paper. Here, it is assumed the claim may be bought in various contract sizes and that investors leverage themselves to own the claim. Hence, it is natural to consider the average indifference (bid)

Date: February 20, 2012.

Key words and phrases. Indifference Pricing, Incomplete Markets, Utility Functions, Large Position Size.

price p, determined implicitly through the equation

$$u_U(x - qp, q) = u_U(x, 0). \tag{1.1}$$

In the above equation, $u_U(x,q)$ represents the optimal value an investor with utility function U can achieve, starting with q units of the non-traded claim, and x dollars which she may freely invest. Thus, p represents the price at which one may purchase units of the claim, such that the investor is indifferent between owning or not owning q units of the claim[1].

As is immediate from (1.1), to compute p, knowledge of the value function $u_U(x,q)$ is crucial. Except for a few special utility functions and models, $u_U(x,q)$ is not explicitly known and this presents the primary challenge for obtaining indifference prices. Absent an explicit formula for $u_U(x,q)$, it is natural to take an approximation. In Kramkov and Sîrbu [2006], approximations to utility-based prices are taken in the limit of a small number of claims (i.e. $q_n \downarrow 0$ for some sequence $(q_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$). In this article, the perspective is taken of an investor with a large position size (i.e. $q_n \uparrow \infty$).

In the small claim limit, Kramkov and Sîrbu [2006] allow $q_n \downarrow 0$ within a fixed market $M \equiv ((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P}), S)$ where $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is a filtered probability space and S is the asset price. For large positions, it is desirable, even necessary, to allow the market to change with the position size and hence study the joint limit of (M_n, q_n) as $q_n \uparrow \infty$. In fact, the large claim limit naturally arises when M_n converges, in some sense, to a complete market (see Section 4.3 for an example). To gain intuition for why this is so, consider when a rational, risk averse investor would, in an incomplete setting, take a large position in an un-traded claim. If the market were fixed, then as the position size increases the unhedgeable component (for one unit) of the claim poses an ever larger problem. Consequently, the investor would not hold a large position unless he was getting the best deal possible, yielding that the large claim limit would either a) *never* arise or b) drive indifference prices towards the minimal arbitrage free price. Clearly, this same argument holds when the market is changing, but not limiting to a complete market in that the unhedgeable component of the claim does not vanish.

Conversely, assuming the investor can purchases shares for a traded price p^T, if the market is becoming complete then the number of shares purchased becomes highly sensitive to p^T and hence the large claim limit naturally arises. As an extreme example, if the market were complete then unless p^T is the unique arbitrage free price it is optimal for the investor to take an infinite position in the claim. Of course, in practice it is not possible to take infinite positions, just like in practice, markets are typically not complete. It is precisely in this setting of near completeness that large claim analysis seeks to provide an approximation.

---

[1] A second formulation for an indifference price comes via the equation $u_U(x,q) = u_U(x + qp, 0)$. This price will not be considered, as the one in (1.1) more closely corresponds to case of where one is highly leveraged: a typical situation for investors holding large positions.

Motivated by the preceeding heuristic argument, approximations to utility indifference prices are obtained for a sequence of positions $q_n \uparrow \infty$, where both the market and the claim are also parameterized by $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, the limiting prices are likely to be of greatest use when the market is becoming complete. To avoid thorny issues regarding the set of admissible trading strategies, most notably, violation of adage that one is allowed to hold the claim and do nothing else, the sequence of claims is assumed to be uniformly bounded and utility functions defined on the whole real line are considered. This is in contrast to the small claim limit where in Kramkov and Sîrbu [2006] the utility function domain is restricted to the positive real axis and a weaker "domination" condition is imposed on the claim. For utility functions on the real line, Owen and Žitković [2009] provides, under minimal conditions, variational representations for utility indifference prices determined by (1.1), upon which the results in this paper heavily rely.

The main result of the paper, Theorem 3.4, states that for indifference pricing purposes, as $n \uparrow \infty$, only the utility function's decay rate at negative infinity (precisely defined in (2.5)) matters. Thus, all utility functions with the same decay rate yield the same price. There is a simple message conveyed by Theorem 3.4 and its immediate consequence, Corollary 3.5: an investor should identify her decay rate at negative infinity and then price as if she were an exponential investor with this absolute risk aversion (see (2.3)). Since for exponential investors, indifference prices are independent of initial wealth, it suffices to consider an initial wealth of zero.

The crucial assumption which yields Theorem 3.4 is that as $n \uparrow \infty$, the monetary certainty equivalent for an exponential utility investor goes to zero for all levels of absolute risk aversion (see Assumption 3.1 and Lemma 3.2). This assumption is mild: in its absence a very strong form of asymptotic arbitrage holds, where there exist trading strategies which yield a profit of at least n with approximate probability $1 - e^{-n}$ (see the discussion following Lemma 3.2).

It is important to note that Assumption 3.1 contains, but is not limited to, the cases of both a fixed market and a market which is becoming complete. It is expected that prices are most useful in the latter case, but prices still may converge in a more general setting. Indeed, in the fixed market case, Proposition 3.6 (proved in Owen and Žitković [2009]) says that prices converge to the minimal arbitrage free price. In fact, Proposition 3.6 does not require the utility function U to achieve a limiting decay rate, as in (2.5). This result, in combination with limiting indifference prices for deterministic claims such as $\sin(n)$, shows there are no necessary and sufficient conditions on the utility function alone which guarantee prices will converge in the large claim limit. However, as Proposition 3.7 proves, the assumption of a limiting decay rate is minimal to ensure prices converge for *all* $q_n \uparrow \infty$ and markets M_n such that (q_n, M_n) satisfies Assumption 3.1.

As mentioned above, Section 3 shows, in a fair level of generality, that as the position size becomes infinite, an investor should identify her utility rate of decay at negative infinity, and then price as though she were an exponential investor with this absolute risk aversion. In Section 4 a number of the questions related to the large claim analysis posed in the heuristic discussion above are addressed. Namely:

i) How useful are the limiting prices if the market is not changing with position size?
ii) If an investor is acting optimally, when does the large claim limit arise?
iii) In the large claim limit, to what are the indifference prices converging for a utility function satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 3.4?

These questions are considered for an exponential investor a class of diffusion models (see (4.1)) where the claim is on a non-traded asset. Depending upon the parameter values, models within this class are called basis risk, or stochastic volatility models. The crucial parameter is the instantaneous correlation ρ_n between the hedgeable and unhedgeable shocks which measures the degree of incompleteness within the market. Using the results of Tehranchi [2004], which identifies the value function for a fixed market and position, it is possible to precisely answer each of the above questions.

Lemma 4.3 in Section 4.2 answers question *i*) by showing that for a fixed $\rho_n \equiv \rho$, indifference prices converge to the minimum possible value the claim could take, and hence cannot reasonably be called a price, since no one would sell at this value. Proposition 4.5 in Section 4.3 takes up the second question, and shows that, given an opportunity to purchase claims for a prescribed price p^T, the limit of $q_n \uparrow \infty$ arises if and only if the market is limiting to a complete model (i.e. $|\rho_n| \rightarrow 1$) and p^T is the not the unique arbitrage free price in this model. Intuitively this result is clear: one would not own a large position unless one is getting a good deal on the price and holding the large position is not too risky. Additionally, Proposition 4.5 identifies the precise rate at which holdings become large : namely, the optimal position size $\hat{q}_n$ satisfies the relationship (see (4.10) and (4.14))

$$\hat{q}_n \times (1-\rho_n^2) \approx K,$$

where K is the optimal quantity of the claim to hold in the limiting complete market, assuming no trading in the underlying asset. Section 4.4 addresses the last of the three questions listed above. Specifically, Proposition 4.6 identifies the limiting indifference price as the certainty equivalent of an exponential investor who owns one unit of the claim in the limiting complete model (see (4.16)).

Section 4 concludes by addressing two topics in the limit that $\rho_n \rightarrow 1$. First, a comparison is made between the limiting indifference and marginal price for an exponential investor. It is shown that even though the limiting model is complete, these two prices need not come together and in fact, (see (4.18)) the well-known differential relationship between marginal and indifference prices is preserved through the large claim, nearly complete limit. Second, an argument is made that the correct notion of "market becoming complete" within this class of models is that $\rho_n \rightarrow 1$, and not any statement regarding the class of equivalent local martingale measures collapsing to a singleton. Indeed, if $\rho_n \rightarrow 1$ then Proposition 4.7 constructs two sequences $\mathbb{Q}_n^1$ and $\mathbb{Q}_n^2$ of local martingale measures such that the relative entropy of $\mathbb{Q}_n^2$ to $\mathbb{Q}_n^1$ is approaching infinity with rate $1/(1-\rho_n^2)$.

Lastly, for exponential utility, risk aversion and claim size are inextricably linked. Given this, Section 5 shows how the results of Theorem 3.4 naturally embed the large position limit pricing problem within that for the large risk aversion limit, thereby making connections with recent results for risk aversion asymptotics (see Carassus and Rásonyi [2011]). Section 6 contains a brief conclusion and Sections 7 – 10 contain all the proofs.

2. Setup

2.1. **Model.** The setup is similar to Owen and Žitković [2009] except that the market is parameterized by $n \in \mathbb{N}$ which is studied in the limit as $n \uparrow \infty$. Specifically, let $T > 0$ denote the horizon. For each n, let $(\Omega^n, \mathcal{F}^n, \mathbb{F}^n, \mathbb{P}^n)$ be a filtered probability space where the filtration $\mathbb{F}^n = (\mathcal{F}^n_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ is assumed to satisfy the usual conditions of right-continuity and $\mathbb{P}^n$ completeness. Assume $\mathcal{F}^n_T = \mathcal{F}^n$. The d risky asset prices $S^n = (S^n_1, \dots, S^n_d)$ are assumed to be a locally bounded, $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued semimartingale (with respect to the given stochastic basis). Zero interest rates are assumed. In addition to being able to trade in the risky assets S^n, the investor owns a non-tradable contingent claim h^n which pays off at time T. The following assumption is made regarding $(h^n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and the size of the position held:

Assumption 2.1. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, h^n is $\mathcal{F}^n$ measurable. The family of claims $(h^n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in that

$$\|h\|_\infty := \sup_n \|h^n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega^n,\mathcal{F}^n,\mathbb{P}^n)} < \infty. \tag{2.1}$$

For $(q_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, q_n of units of the claim h^n are held and $q_n \to \infty$ as $n \uparrow \infty$.

Remark 2.2. Since $(h^n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying Assumption 2.1 implies $(-h^n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ does as well, there is no loss of generality in assuming $q_n \uparrow \infty$.

Example 2.3. Two examples to keep in mind are based off of the following model:

$$\frac{dS^n_t}{S^n_t} = \mu(Y_t)dt + \sigma(Y_t)dZ_t; \qquad dY_t = b(Y_t)dt + a(Y_t)dW_t; \qquad d[W,Z]_t = \rho_n dt, \tag{2.2}$$

where Z, W are Brownian motions and $\rho_n \in (-1, 1)$. In the first example, $h^n = h(Y_T)$ for some bounded, measurable function h on the state space of Y. Depending on the parameter values, these are typically called either basis-risk or stochastic volatility models and the goal is to price options on the non-traded asset Y. For exponential utility, utility-based pricing in such models has been extensively studied : see Henderson [2002]; Davis [1997]; Tehranchi [2004]; Musiela and Zariphopoulou [2004]; Frei and Schweizer [2008, 2009]; Carmona [2009]; Monoyios [2007] amongst others. In the second example, $h^n = h(S^n_T)$ for some bounded, measurable function h on $(0, \infty)$. The goal is to price claims which are not easily traded and cannot be replicated by trading in S^n. For these models, see İlhan et al. [2009]; Carmona [2009] for utility-based pricing results which are based on Partial Differential Equation methods.

2.2. **Utility Functions.** Recall that for a concave increasing function $U \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$, the *absolute risk aversion* is given by

$$\alpha_U(x) := -\frac{U''(x)}{U'(x)}. \tag{2.3}$$

With this notation, the following family of utility functions is considered:

Definition 2.4. Let $\alpha > 0$. Define $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ to be the class of functions $U \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ which satisfy

i) $U'(0) = 1$ and $\lim_{x\uparrow\infty} U(x) = 0$.

ii) There exists some $K_U > 1$ such that, for $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\frac{1}{K_U} \leq \alpha_U(x) \leq K_U. \tag{2.4}$$

iii) For large negative wealths, $-U$ achieves the growth rate:

$$\lim_{x\downarrow-\infty} -\frac{1}{x}\log\left(-U(x)\right) = \alpha. \tag{2.5}$$

For a given $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$, Lemma 9.1 shows that *ii)* implies U satisfies the hypothesis of Reasonable Asymptotic Elasticity given in Schachermayer [2001]. Furthermore, if $\lim_{x\downarrow-\infty} \alpha_U(x) = \alpha$ then, using l'Hospital's rule, condition *ii)* implies (2.5) holds. However, it is not necessary that the absolute risk aversion converge for U to be in $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$. For example, set

$$U(x) = -\frac{1}{\alpha(1+K)} e^{-\alpha(x+K\sin(x))}.$$

For $K > 0$ small enough, $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ but $\alpha_U(x)$ has no limit as $x \downarrow -\infty$. Note that the renormalizations in *i)* are done to make sure $\log(-U(x))$ is defined for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. If a function $\tilde{U} \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies conditions *ii)* and *iii)* then it is bounded from above and limits to $-\infty$ as $x \downarrow -\infty$. In this instance, (2.5) is still well defined for large negative x and

$$U(x) := \frac{1}{\tilde{U}'(0)}\left(\tilde{U}(x) - \tilde{U}(\infty)\right) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha.$$

For $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$, define $V : (0,\infty) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ to be the convex conjugate of U:

$$V(y) := \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} \left\{U(x) - xy\right\}. \tag{2.6}$$

As is shown in Lemma 9.3, $V \in C^2(0,\infty)$ is strictly convex, can be continuously extended to 0 by setting $V(0) = 0$, and

$$\lim_{y\uparrow\infty} \frac{V(y)}{y(\log y - 1)} = \frac{1}{\alpha}. \tag{2.7}$$

The canonical example of a function in $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ is the exponential utility:

$$U_\alpha(x) := -\frac{1}{\alpha} e^{-\alpha x}. \tag{2.8}$$

(2.5) implies that each $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ has the same asymptotic behavior at $-\infty$ as U_α. Furthermore, (2.7) implies V has the same asymptotic behavior as $y \uparrow \infty$ as the convex conjugate V_α to U_α in (2.8):

$$V_\alpha(y) = \frac{1}{\alpha} y(\log y - 1). \tag{2.9}$$

2.3. **Martingale Measures.** Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathcal{M}^{n,a}$ denote the set of probability measures $\mathbb{Q}^n \ll \mathbb{P}^n$ on $\mathcal{F}^n$ such that S^n is a local martingale under $\mathbb{Q}^n$. Recall that for any $\mu \ll \mathbb{P}^n$ on $\mathcal{F}^n$ the relative entropy of μ with respect to $\mathbb{P}^n$ is given by

$$H\left(\mu \mid \mathbb{P}^n\right) := \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^n}\left[\frac{d\mu}{d\mathbb{P}^n} \log\left(\frac{d\mu}{d\mathbb{P}^n}\right)\right]. \tag{2.10}$$

The subset of $\mathcal{M}^{n,a}$ containing measures with finite relative entropy with respect to $\mathbb{P}^n$ plays a central role. Therefore, define:

Definition 2.5.

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a} := \left\{\mathbb{Q}^n \in \mathcal{M}^{n,a} \ : \ H\left(\mathbb{Q}^n \mid \mathbb{P}^n\right) < \infty\right\}. \tag{2.11}$$

The following assumption on $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}$ is standard (see [Owen and Žitković, 2009, Assumption 1.4]) and essentially rules out arbitrage opportunities when investing in S^n.

Assumption 2.6. For each n, $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a} \neq \emptyset$.

2.4. **The Value Functions.** Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A trading strategy H^n is said to be admissible if it is predictable, S^n integrable under $\mathbb{P}^n$, and such that the gains process $(H^n \cdot S^n)$ remains bounded above a constant a (which may depend upon H^n) almost surely on $[0, T]$. Denote by $\mathcal{H}^n$ the set of admissible trading strategies.

Let $\alpha > 0$ and $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$. For $x, q \in \mathbb{R}$, the value function $u^n_U(x, q; h^n)$ is defined by

$$u^n_U(x, q; h^n) := \sup_{H^n \in \mathcal{H}^n} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^n}\left[U\left(x + (H^n \cdot S^n)_T + q h^n\right)\right]. \tag{2.12}$$

Remark 2.7. n appears in two places in the value function. The superscript n outside the parentheses represents the fact that the assets S^n and local martingale measures $\mathbb{Q}^n$ are changing with n. The n in h^n represents the fact that the claim may be changing with n. In the case where $h^n \equiv 0$, set

$$u^n_U(x) := u^n_U(x, q; 0). \tag{2.13}$$

2.5. **Utility Indifference Pricing.** Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha > 0$, $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and $x, q \in \mathbb{R}$. For h^n satisfying Assumption 2.1, define the average utility indifference (bid) price $p^n_U(x, q; h^n)$ implicitly as the solution to the equation

$$u^n_U(x) = u^n_U(x - q p^n_U(x, q; h^n), q; h^n). \tag{2.14}$$

Thus, $p^n_U(x, q; h^n)$ is the amount an investor would pay per unit of h^n so as to be indifferent between owning and not owning q units of the claim.

3. Indifference Prices in the Large Claim Limit

Let $(h^n, q_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be as in Assumption 2.1. $p^n_U(x, q_n; h^n)$ is now studied in the limit that $n \uparrow \infty$. Proofs of all assertions made herein are given in Section 7.

3.1. **Assumptions and Main Results.** Results are obtained under the following:

Assumption 3.1.

$$\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} \frac{1}{q_n} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}^n\in\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}} H\left(\mathbb{Q}^n \mid \mathbb{P}^n\right) = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

As the next Lemma shows, Assumption 3.1 is intimately connected with the value functions $u^n_U(x)$ from (2.13) for $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ as $n \uparrow \infty$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.6 hold. The following are equivalent:*

1) Assumption 3.1 holds.

2) For each $\alpha > 0$, $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} \frac{1}{q_n} \log(-u^n_U(x)) = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

3) For some $\alpha > 0$, $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} \frac{1}{q_n} \log(-u^n_U(x)) = 0. \tag{3.3}$$

Consider when Assumption 3.1 does not hold : i.e. there is a $\beta > 0$, subsequence $n_k \uparrow \infty$ and integer N_k such that for $n_k \geq N_k$, $\inf_{\mathbb{Q}^{n_k}\in\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n_k,a}} H\left(\mathbb{Q}^{n_k} \mid \mathbb{P}^{n_k}\right) \geq \beta q_{n_k}$. One consequence of this is that for any $\alpha > 0$ and n_k large enough there is an admissible trading strategy $H(\alpha, n_k)$ satisfying

$$\mathbb{P}^n\left[\left(H\left(\alpha, n_k\right)_t \cdot S^{n_k}\right)_T \geq \frac{\beta q_{n_k}}{4\alpha}\right] \geq 1 - e^{-q_{n_k}\beta/2}.$$

Thus, in the absence of Assumption 3.1 a very strong form of asymptotic arbitrage holds : namely, there exists a sequence of permissable trading strategies such that the probability the terminal wealth fails to grow like q_{n_k} decreases to 0 exponentially fast on the order of q_{n_k}. An asymptotic arbitrage of the form above is similar to a *strong arbitrage* as defined in Föllmer and Schachermayer [2007]: see this reference for a more detailed discussion on the topic.

Remark 3.3. Note that Assumption 3.1 holds for any $q_n \uparrow \infty$ if

$$\limsup_{n\uparrow\infty} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}^n\in\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}} H\left(\mathbb{Q}^n \mid \mathbb{P}^n\right) < \infty. \tag{3.4}$$

As shown in Section 4.3, the large claim limit naturally arises in the case where the market is "becoming complete" in the sense that the models S^n limit to a model S^∞, which is complete with unique local martingale measure $\mathbb{Q}$. In this case, (3.4) holds as soon as $H\left(\mathbb{Q} \mid \mathbb{P}\right) < \infty$.

The main result of the section is now presented. Essentially, it proves that all $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ yield the same average indifference prices as $n \uparrow \infty$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let* $\alpha > 0$. *Let Assumptions 2.1, 2.6 and 3.1 hold. Then there exist universal constants* $\overline{K}, \underline{K} \in \mathbb{R}$ *such that for all* $x \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$

$$\limsup_{n\uparrow\infty} p^n_U(x, q_n; h^n) = \overline{K}; \qquad \liminf_{n\uparrow\infty} p^n_U(x, q_n; h^n) = \underline{K}. \tag{3.5}$$

The following Corollary is immediate and shows that practically, it suffices to consider the exponential utility.

Corollary 3.5. *Let* $\alpha > 0$. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.6 and 3.1 hold. If there exists a* $K^* \in \mathbb{R}$ *such that for some* $x^* \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $U^* \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$, $\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} p^n_{U^*}(x^*, q_n; h^n) = K^*$, *then for all* $x \in \mathbb{R}$ *and all* $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$, $\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} p^n_U(x, q_n; h^n) = K^*$. *In particular, it suffices to check* $x^* = 0$ *and the exponential utility* U_α *from* (2.8).

3.2. **Pricing when Only the Position is Changing.** Theorem 3.4 shows that under certain mild conditions on the markets and claims, each $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ prices the same asymptotically. Consider when nothing is changing with n except the position size:

$$(\Omega^n, \mathcal{F}^n, \mathbb{F}^n, \mathbb{P}^n) \equiv (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P}); \qquad S^n \equiv S; \qquad h^n \equiv h. \tag{3.6}$$

In this instance, the forthcoming Proposition, proved in [Owen and Žitković, 2009, Proposition 7.5], states that prices converge even if (2.5) fails. Since $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}$ does not change with n, write $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^a = \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{1,a}$ and $p_U(x, q; h)$ for $p^n_U(x, q; h)$.

Proposition 3.6. *Let* $U \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ *satisfy conditions* $i, ii)$ *in Definition 2.4. Let the model be as in* (3.6) *and such that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.6 hold. Then for all* $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} p_U(x, q_n; h) = \inf_{\mathbb{Q}\in\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^a} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[h\right]. \tag{3.7}$$

In essence, if nothing is changing with n except the position size, which itself if becoming increasingly large, then the investor's risk aversion will "take over" and the only price she will be willing to pay for h is the smallest arbitrage free ([İlhan et al., 2005, Definition 2.1]) price.

3.3. **On the Necessity of** (2.5) **in Definition 2.4.** Proposition 3.6 shows that if $U \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies condition $i, ii)$ in Definition 2.4 then, asymptotically, the average indifference prices still may converge, even if (2.5) does not hold. Similarly, by considering the deterministic claim $h^n = \sin(n)$ it is clear that prices may not converge for any utility function, irrespective of whether (2.5) holds.

Therefore, it is impossible to give necessary and sufficient conditions on the utility function alone which guarantee convergence. However, the following Proposition shows that condition (2.5) is minimal to guarantee convergence in all markets satisfying Assumptions 2.1, 2.6 and 3.1 where prices for the exponential utility function do converge.

Proposition 3.7. *Let* $\hat{U} \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ *satisfy conditions* $i, ii)$ *in Definition 2.4 but assume that* (2.5) *fails in that*

$$\underline{\alpha} = \liminf_{x \downarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{x} \log\left(-\hat{U}(x)\right) < \limsup_{x \downarrow -\infty} -\frac{1}{x} \log\left(-\hat{U}(x)\right) = \overline{\alpha}. \tag{3.8}$$

Then, there exists a sequence of markets $(\Omega^n, \mathcal{F}^n, \mathbb{F}^n, \mathbb{P}^n)$, S^n, *claims* h^n *and position sizes* $q_n \uparrow \infty$ *such that*

1) *Assumptions 2.1, 2.6, 3.1 are satisfied.*
2) *For all* $x \in \mathbb{R}$, *the indifference prices* $p^n_{\hat{U}}(x, q_n; h^n)$ *cannot converge as* $n \uparrow \infty$.
3) *For all* $\alpha > 0$, *all* $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ *and all* $x \in \mathbb{R}$, *the indifference prices* $p^n_U(x, q_n; h^n)$ *converge as* $n \uparrow \infty$.

4. Pricing for Basis Risk Models

The results of Section 3 are now specified to the class of models from Example 2.3. Proofs of all assertions made herein are given in Section 8.

4.1. Model and Assumptions.

Consider the model:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS^n_t}{S^n_t} &= \mu(Y_t)dt + \sigma(Y_t)\rho_n dW_t + \sigma(Y_t)\sqrt{1-\rho_n^2}dB_t; \quad S^n_0 = 1, \\ dY_t &= b(Y_t)dt + a(Y_t)dW_t; \quad Y_0 = y_0, \\ h^n &= h(Y_T). \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

The probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is two-dimensional Wiener space and the filtration is the augmented version of the right-continuous enlargement of the natural filtration $\mathcal{F}^{W,B}$. The following assumptions are made regarding the coefficients in (4.1). It is evident that under these assumptions, Assumptions 2.1,2.6 and 3.1 hold for any $q_n \to \infty$.

Assumption 4.1. For some open, connected interval $E \subset \mathbb{R}$, a and b are locally bounded, Borel measurable functions from E to $\mathbb{R}$ such that there is a strong solution (with respect to the $\mathbb{P}$-augmented filtration of W) to the stochastic differential equation for Y and Y takes values in E for $0 \leq t \leq T$. μ and σ are bounded, measurable maps from E to $\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\lambda(y) := \mu(y)/\sigma(y) \tag{4.2}$$

is bounded on E. h is a continuous, bounded function from E to $\mathbb{R}$ and $\rho_n \in (-1, 1)$ for all n.

Example 4.2. The canonical example (and the motivation for the name "basis risk") is when S^n and Y are two geometric Brownian motions with instantaneous correlation ρ_n. This corresponds to $\mu(y) = \mu$, $\sigma(y) = \sigma$, $b(y) = by$ and $a(y) = ay$ for some $\mu, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma, a > 0$. Pricing results for these models have been obtained in Henderson [2002]; Davis [1997]; Musiela and Zariphopoulou [2004] amongst others.

4.2. **Constant Correlations.** Let $\alpha > 0$, $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and assume for all n that $\rho_n = \rho$ for $\rho \in (-1,1)$. In this case S is not changing with n so write $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^a = \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{1,a}$. According to Proposition 3.6, the average utility indifference price converges to $\inf_{\mathbb{Q}\in\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^a} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[h(Y_T)\right]$. Specified to the above model, this price is the minimum value of $h(y)$ on E as the following Lemma shows:

Lemma 4.3. *Let Assumption 4.1 hold. Then*

$$\inf_{\mathbb{Q}\in\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^a} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[h(Y_T)\right] = \underset{\mathbb{P}}{ess\ inf}[h(Y_T)] = \inf_{y\in E} h(y). \tag{4.3}$$

Since no one will sell at the minimum possible value for h, ρ_n must be changing with n in order for prices in the large claim limit to be of use. Indeed, this result is the primary motivation for parameterizing the markets by n. To motivate how ρ_n must change for the large claim limit to yield viable prices, the next section investigates the relationship between the market and position size.

4.3. **Optimal Quantities for a Given Price.** Let ρ_n be given. By Lemma 4.3 (the upper bound follows in a similar manner to the lower bound) the range of arbitrage free prices for $h(Y_T)$ is given by the interval

$$I(h) := (\inf_{y\in E} h(y), \sup_{y\in E} h(y)). \tag{4.4}$$

Let $p \in I(h)$. Assuming that one can buy an arbitrary number of claims of $h(Y_T)$ for the price p the question naturally arises as to what the optimal number q is. One possible way to answer this question, taking into account investor preferences, is to solve the variational problem

$$\max_{q\in\mathbb{R}} \ u_U^n(x - qp, q; h), \tag{4.5}$$

and identify an optimal $q(p)$. In utility based pricing terminology, one seeks a $q(p)$ such that p is a marginal utility price at $(x - pq(p), q(p))$. For utility functions defined on the positive axis, Siorpaes [2010] gives general conditions under which (4.5) admits a maximizer, though no practical method for finding the maximizer. For $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$, in light of Corollary 3.5, it is natural to first solve this problem for the exponential utility. In this case, under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.6, [İlhan et al., 2005, Theorem 3.1] proves existence of a unique maximizer $q(p)$ to (4.5). In the basis risk model, using the results of Tehranchi [2004], it is possible to precisely identify $q(p)$. For ease of presentation, for a given $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$, set

$$Z(\rho) := \mathcal{E}\left(-\rho\int_0^\cdot \lambda(Y_t)dW_t\right)_T. \tag{4.6}$$

Lemma 4.4. *Let Assumption 4.1 hold, $p \in I(h)$. The unique $q_n(p)$ solving (4.5) for $U_\alpha(x) = -e^{-\alpha x}/\alpha$ takes the form*

$$q_n(p) = \frac{\beta_n}{\alpha(1-\rho_n^2)}, \tag{4.7}$$

where β_n is the unique real number satisfying the equality

$$p = \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[Z(\rho_n)h(Y_T)\exp\left(-\beta_n h(Y_T) - \frac{1}{2}(1-\rho_n^2)\int_0^T \lambda(Y_t)^2 dt\right)\right]}{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[Z(\rho_n)\exp\left(-\beta_n h(Y_T) - \frac{1}{2}(1-\rho_n^2)\int_0^T \lambda(Y_t)^2 dt\right)\right]}. \tag{4.8}$$

Using Lemma 4.4, the following Proposition provides precise conditions when the optimal number of claims $q_n(p)$ becomes large for an exponential investor:

Proposition 4.5. *Let Assumption 4.1 hold. Let $p \in I(h)$ and define $q_n(p)$ as in (4.7). Assume that $\rho_n \to \rho$ for some $\rho \in [-1,1]$. Then $\sup_n |q_n(p)| = \infty$ if and only if $|\rho| = 1$ and $p \neq \hat{p}$ where*

$$\hat{p} = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[Z(\rho)h(Y_T)\right]. \tag{4.9}$$

In all cases,

$$\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} q_n(p)(1-\rho_n^2) = \frac{\beta_*}{\alpha}, \tag{4.10}$$

where β_* is the unique real number satisfying

$$p = \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[Z(\rho)h(Y_T)\exp\left(-\beta_* h(Y_T) - \frac{1}{2}(1-\rho^2)\int_0^T \lambda(Y_t)^2 dt\right)\right]}{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[Z(\rho)\exp\left(-\beta_* h(Y_T) - \frac{1}{2}(1-\rho^2)\int_0^T \lambda(Y_t)^2 dt\right)\right]}. \tag{4.11}$$

Consider the case when $\rho_n \to 1$. In this case, the limiting model is complete with unique local martingale measure $\mathbb{Q} \sim \mathbb{P}$ where

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} = Z(1) = \mathcal{E}\left(-\int_0^{\cdot} \lambda(Y_t)dW_t\right)_T. \tag{4.12}$$

The equation for β_* simplifies considerably to

$$p = \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[h(Y_T)e^{-\beta_* h(Y_T)}\right]}{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[e^{-\beta_* h(Y_T)}\right]}, \tag{4.13}$$

and $\hat{p}$ from (4.9) is just the unique arbitrage free price for $h(Y_T)$ in the limiting model. Using (4.13) it is clear that if $p \neq \hat{p}$ then $\beta_* \neq 0$ and the large claim limit is encountered. It is not immediately clear that if $\beta_* = 0$ then the large claim limit is not met, but indeed this is the case. Thus, an investor, acting in an optimal manner, will encounter the large claim limit if and only if

i) The market is "becoming complete" in the sense that $\rho_n \to 1$.
ii) The traded price p is not the unique arbitrage free price for $h(Y_T)$ in the limiting model.

In other words, the large claim limit is met if the investor, though not receiving an arbitrage opportunity, is none the less getting a good deal. From (4.13), it is clear that β_* is found by exponentially tilting $h(Y_T)$ under $\mathbb{Q}$ by a factor of β until the mean of $h(Y_T)$ under the tilted measure is p. An alternative interpretation for β_* comes by considering the variational problem

(4.5) for exponential utility in the limiting, complete model, and under the restriction that one cannot trade in the underlying asset. In this case, the problem is to solve

$$\max_{q\in\mathbb{R}} -\frac{e^{-\alpha x+\alpha qp}}{\alpha}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[e^{-q\alpha h(Y_T)}\right]. \tag{4.14}$$

It can easily be seen that the optimal q takes the form $q = \beta_*/\alpha$. It is interesting to note from (4.10) that once the incompleteness parameter $1-\rho_n^2$ is accounted for, determining the optimal number of claims to hold essentially comes down to solving (4.14). In other words, one need only identify the optimal constant β_* and then hold $\beta_*/(\alpha(1-\rho_n^2))$ number of claims.

4.4. **Pricing for $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$.** In this section, large pricing results for $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ are given in the limit $\rho_n \uparrow 1$. In light of Proposition 4.5 it is assumed that for some $\gamma \neq 0$

$$q_n = \frac{\gamma}{(1-\rho_n^2)}. \tag{4.15}$$

Note that it is not assumed $\gamma = \beta_*/\alpha$ from Proposition 4.5. This is because $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ are considered and the quantity based upon β_* was specific to the exponential utility. However, the qualitative idea that

position size x incompleteness parameter ≈ constant

is maintained. With this q_n the following holds:

Proposition 4.6. *Let $\alpha > 0$ and $x^* \in \mathbb{R}$. Let Assumption 4.1 hold. Let $\mathbb{Q}$ be defined via* (4.12). *Assume $\rho_n \uparrow 1$ and q_n is given by* (4.15). *Then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$*

$$\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} p_U^n(x,q_n;h) = -\frac{1}{\alpha\gamma}\log\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[e^{-\alpha\gamma h(Y_T)}\right]. \tag{4.16}$$

Therefore, $p_U^n(x;q_n;h)$ limits to the certainty equivalent for $h(Y_Y)$ under $\mathbb{Q}$ for an exponential investor with risk aversion $\alpha\gamma$.

4.5. **A Comparison.** It is interesting to compare the marginal and indifference prices in the large claim limit. To make this comparison, assume $\rho_n \uparrow 1$, let $p \in I(h), p \neq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[h(Y_T)]$ and take the following steps:

1) Compute $q_n(p)$ according to (4.7) and (4.8).
2) For this $q_n(p)$ compute the average utility indifference price $p^n_{U_\alpha}(x,q_n(p);h)$ for exponential utility.
3) Compute $\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} p^n_{U_\alpha}(x,q_n(p);h)$.

Completing these three steps, Propositions 4.5 and 4.6 imply (see equations (4.13) and (4.16))

$$\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} p^n_{U_\alpha}(x,q_n(p);h) = -\frac{1}{\beta_*}\log\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[e^{-\beta_* h(Y_T)}\right]; \qquad p = \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[h(Y_T)e^{-\beta_* h(Y_T)}\right]}{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[e^{-\beta_* h(Y_T)}\right]}, \tag{4.17}$$

where β_* is from (4.13). Note that the limiting indifference price does not depend upon α. Thus, for any $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and any $\alpha > 0$ the role of the limiting decay rate α is restricted to determining the optimal quantity $q_n(p)$ of claims to hold for a given arbitrage free price.

To compare the two quantities in (4.17) define the functions

$$p_i(\beta) = -\frac{1}{\beta}\log \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[e^{-\beta h(Y_T)}\right]; \qquad p_m(\beta) = \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[h(Y_T)e^{-\beta h(Y_T)}\right]}{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[e^{-\beta h(Y_T)}\right]}. \tag{4.18}$$

The dominated convergence theorem implies $(d/d\beta)\left(\beta p_i(\beta)\right) = p_m(\beta)$. For general models, it is well known for exponential utility that the marginal and indifference prices, as functions of the number of claims q (they are not functions of initial wealth x), satisfy the same differential relationship. Therefore, once the incompleteness and growth parameters are accounted for, the differential relationship between the marginal and (average) indifference prices is preserved through the large claim, nearly complete limit.

In complete markets, all utility based prices take same value as the unique arbitrage free price. Since the limiting market is complete, one may think that the two quantities in (4.17) are equal: i.e. that $p_i(\beta_*) = p_m(\beta_*)$. However, an elementary calculation shows this is not the case. Indeed, $p_i(\beta)$ and $p_m(\beta)$ only come together at $\beta = 0$. Else, p_i is greater than p_m for $\beta > 0$ and less for $\beta < 0$.

Recall the formula for β_* given in (4.13). This section concludes with a Proposition which gives an alternate description of the difference $p_i(\beta_*) - p_m(\beta)$ in terms of the limiting relative entropy between two sequences of local martingale measures. The purpose of this lemma is to show that even though the model is "becoming complete" in that $\rho_n \to 1$ it is absolutely not true that the family of local martingale measures is collapsing, with respect to relative entropy, to the unique local martingale measure of the limiting model. Before stating Proposition 4.7 recall that for exponential utility it follows that Owen and Žitković [2009]; Delbaen et al. [2002]

$$u^n_{U_\alpha}(x, q; h^n) = \inf_{\mathbb{Q}^n \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}} \left(-\frac{e^{-\alpha x}}{\alpha}\exp\left(-H\left(\mathbb{Q}^n \mid \mathbb{P}^n\right) - \alpha q \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^n}\left[h^n\right]\right)\right), \tag{4.19}$$

and that for each n there exist a unique minimizer to the above variational problem.

Proposition 4.7. *Let Assumption 4.1 hold. Let $\rho_n \uparrow 1$, $p \in I(h)$, $q_n(p)$ as in (4.7) and let β_* be as in Proposition 4.5. Then*

$$p_i(\beta_*) - p_m(\beta_*) = \lim_{n\uparrow\infty} \frac{1-\rho_n^2}{\beta_n} H\left(\mathbb{Q}^{n,q_n(p)} \mid \mathbb{Q}^{n,0}\right), \tag{4.20}$$

where

1) $\mathbb{Q}^{n,q_n(p)} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}$ solves the dual problem (4.19) with $q_n(p)$.

2) $\mathbb{Q}^{n,0} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}$ is the "minimal entropy martingale measure" in that it solves the dual problem (4.19) for $h \equiv 0$.

Proposition 4.7 shows that for $p \neq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[h(Y_T)\right]$, since $\beta_* \neq 0$, the relative entropy between the local martingale measures $\mathbb{Q}^{n,q_n(p)}$ and $\mathbb{Q}^{n,0}$ is approaching infinity with rate $(1-\rho_n^2)^{-1}$.

5. Connections with Risk Aversion Asymptotics

It is a (un)fortunate aspect of exponential utility that the absolute risk aversion and the number of units of the claim held are interchangeable with respect to indifference pricing. Specifically, the average indifference price one would pay for $q > 0$ claims of h^n, given a level $\alpha > 0$ of absolute risk aversion, is the same indifference price one would pay for 1 claim of h^n at a level of $q\alpha$ of risk aversion. This can easily be seen by noting that for any $q, \alpha > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, under Assumptions 2.1, 2.6 (recall that U_α is given in (2.8))

$$U_\alpha(qx) = qU_{q\alpha}(x); \quad u^n_{U_\alpha}(x, q; h^n) = e^{-\alpha x} u^n_{U_\alpha}(0, q; h^n); \quad H^n \in \mathcal{H}^{n,adm} \Longleftrightarrow qH^n \in \mathcal{H}^{n,adm}.$$

Therefore (recall the notation in (2.13))

$$p^n_{U_\alpha}(x, q; h^n) = \frac{1}{\alpha q} \log\left(\frac{u^n_{U_\alpha}(0)}{u^n_{U_\alpha}(0, q; h^n)}\right) = \frac{1}{\alpha q} \log\left(\frac{q u^n_{U_{q\alpha}}(0)}{q u^n_{U_{q\alpha}}(0, 1; h^n)}\right) = p^n_{U_{q\alpha}}(x, 1; h^n).$$

Indifference pricing in the large risk aversion limit has been studied by many authors. Rouge and El Karoui [2000] and Delbaen et al. [2002] consider the case of exponential utility and, more recently, Carassus and Rásonyi [2007, 2011] extend results to general utility functions on the real line. In each of these articles, it is shown, under suitable hypothesis on the market and utility function, that as absolute risk aversion increases to infinity, *if the market and claim are not changing as well*, then the (ask) indifference price for one claim converges the super-replication price of the claim. This is entirely consistent with the results in Section 3.2 since therein it is the buyer's indifference price which is considered.

Thus, an alternative interpretation of Theorem 3.4 is that under Assumptions 2.1, 2.6 and 3.1, for any $\alpha > 0$ and $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$, as $n \uparrow \infty$ the average indifference price for q_n claims of h^n will converge to the indifference price for one claim of h^n for an exponential investor with risk aversion $q_n\alpha$, assuming this latter limit exists. In this sense a large claim investor with utility $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ is transformed into an exponential investor with an extreme risk aversion $q_n\alpha$.

6. Conclusion

This article considers the problem of obtaining average utility indifference prices for investors holding a large number of contingent claims and whose preferences can be described by a utility function on the whole real line. It is shown under minimal assumptions on the model (or sequence thereof) that, as the number of claims approaches infinity, all utility functions with the same limiting decay rate for large negative wealths price the same. Practically this means an investor with a large holding should identify her decay rate at negative infinity and price as if she was an exponential investor with this rate.

In the case when nothing is changing but the position in the claim, average indifference prices limit to the minimal arbitrage free price for the claim. Thus for prices to be of practical use, the market must also be changing with the position size. In a large class of Markovian models, it is shown that if an investor, acting optimally, has a chance to buy claims for a given price p the large claim limit is achieved precisely when the market is becoming complete, in that asset and volatility correlations are approaching one, and the price p is the not the limiting arbitrage free price. In fact, once the incompleteness parameter is accounted for, optimal positions remain approximately constant. In the large claim limit, indifference prices converge to the certainty equivalent for the claim for an exponential investor. Furthermore, the differential relationship between indifference and marginal utility based prices is preserved and even if the limiting model is complete, these prices typically are not converging to one another.

7. Proofs from Section 3

Remark 7.1. **Remarks on Notation**. Unless explicitly otherwise stated, all expectations within this section are taken with respect to $\mathbb{P}^n$ and denoted by $\mathbb{E}^n$. For any $\mathbb{Q}^n \ll \mathbb{P}^n$ write

$$Z^{\mathbb{Q},n} := \left.\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^n}{d\mathbb{P}^n}\right|_{\mathcal{F}^n}. \tag{7.1}$$

Before stating the proofs, it is necessary to introduce some notation, as well as state some results from Owen and Žitković [2009]. Let $\alpha > 0$, $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and define V as in (2.6). For any $\mathbb{Q}^n \ll \mathbb{P}^n$, the U - generalized relative entropy of μ with respect to $\mathbb{P}^n$ is given by

$$H_V\left(\mathbb{Q}^n \mid \mathbb{P}^n\right) := \mathbb{E}^n\left[V\left(Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right)\right]. \tag{7.2}$$

Define $\mathcal{M}_V^{n;a}$ as the set of $\mathbb{Q}^n \in \mathcal{M}^{n,a}$ such that $H_V\left(\mathbb{Q}^n \mid \mathbb{P}^n\right) < \infty$. The following Lemma shows that $\mathcal{M}_V^{n;a}$ does not depend upon U for $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$.

Lemma 7.2. *Let $\alpha > 0$ and $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$. Then $\mathcal{M}_V^{n;a} = \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}$.*

Proof of Lemma 7.2. This follows immediately by applying Lemma 10.2 applied to $Y = Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}$, $y = 1$ and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) = (\Omega^n, \mathcal{F}^n, \mathbb{P}^n)$. □

In addition to the primal value function $u_U^n(x, q; h^n)$ defined in (2.12), and in light of Lemma 7.2, define the dual value function $v_U^n(x, q; h^n)$ as

$$v_U^n(x, q; h^n) := \inf_{y \geq 0} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}^n \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}} \mathbb{E}^n\left[V\left(yZ^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right) + yZ^{\mathbb{Q},n}\left(x + qh^n\right)\right]. \tag{7.3}$$

The following result from [Owen and Žitković, 2009, Theorems 1.8, 1.9] connects the primal and dual value functions:

Theorem 7.3. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha > 0$, $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and $x, q \in \mathbb{R}$. Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.6 it follows that $u_U^n(x, q; h^n) = v_U^n(x, q; h^n) < 0$.*

With these preparations, the proof of Lemma 3.2 is now given.

Proof Lemma 3.2. Note: as seen in the proof below, this result holds for all $U \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying conditions $i, ii)$ of Definition 2.4 and hence (2.5) is not necessary.

First, some facts regarding exponential utility are stated. Let $\delta > 0$ and set $U_\delta(x) = -(1/\delta)e^{-\delta x}$. Set V_δ as in (2.9) (with δ replacing α therein). It is easily seen that $\mathcal{M}^{n,a}_{V_\delta} = \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}$ and, by specifying (7.3) when $h^n \equiv 0$, that under Assumption 2.6, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$u^n_{U_\delta}(x) = -\frac{1}{\delta}e^{-\delta x - \inf_{\mathbb{Q}^n \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}} H(\mathbb{Q}^n \mid \mathbb{P}^n)}. \tag{7.4}$$

The equivalences are now shown. Note that $u^n_U(x) \geq U(x)$ and thus it automatically holds that $\limsup_{n\uparrow\infty}(1/q_n)\log(-u^n_U(x)) \leq 0$. Therefore, to prove (3.2) (resp. (3.3)) it suffices to show $\liminf_{n\uparrow}(1/q_n)\log(-u^n_U(x)) \geq 0$ for each $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha, x \in \mathbb{R}$ (resp. some $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha, x \in \mathbb{R}$).

1) $\Rightarrow$ 2). Set $\beta_n = (1/q_n)\inf_{\mathbb{Q}^n \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}} H(\mathbb{Q}^n \mid \mathbb{P}^n) \geq 0$. By assumption, $\beta_n \to 0$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$. For any $\delta > 0$, by (7.4)

$$-u^n_{U_\delta}(x) = \frac{1}{\delta}e^{-\delta x - q_n\beta_n}. \tag{7.5}$$

Let $\alpha > 0$ and $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$. By construction of $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$, for $0 < \delta < (K_U)^{-1}$ it follows that $\alpha_U(x) \geq \delta$ on $x \in \mathbb{R}$. By [Föllmer and Schied, 2004, Proposition 2.47], $U(x) = F(U_\delta(x))$ for some strictly increasing, concave function F. Thus, Jensen's inequality implies $u^n_U(x) \leq u^n_{U_\delta}(x)$ and hence

$$\liminf_{n\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{q_n}\log(-u^n_U(x)) \geq \liminf_{n\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{q_n}\log\left(-F\left(u^n_{U_\delta}(x)\right)\right). \tag{7.6}$$

In fact, $F(x) = U(U_\delta^{-1}(x))$. Since $U_\delta^{-1}(x) = -\frac{1}{\delta}\log(-\delta x)$, (7.5) implies

$$-F(u^n_{U_\delta}(x)) = -U\left(x + \frac{q_n\beta_n}{\delta}\right). \tag{7.7}$$

Let $\beta > 0$. For large enough n, $\beta_n < \beta$ and hence $-U(x + q_n\beta_n/\delta) \geq -U(x + q_n\beta/\delta)$. Thus, (7.7) and Lemma 9.1 (with $a = x, b = \beta/\delta, x = q_n$) give

$$\liminf_{n\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{q_n}\log\left(-F(u^n_{U_\delta}(x))\right) \geq \liminf_{n\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{q_n}\log\left(-U\left(x + \frac{q_n\beta}{\delta}\right)\right) \geq -\frac{\beta}{\delta}K_U.$$

The result follows by taking $\beta \downarrow 0$ and using (7.6).

2) $\Rightarrow$ 3). Obvious.

3) $\Rightarrow$ 1). Let $\alpha > 0$, $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\liminf_{n\uparrow\infty}(1/q_n)\log(-u^n_U(x)) \geq 0$. By construction of $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$, for $\delta > K_U$ it follows that $\alpha_U(x) \leq \delta$ on $\mathbb{R}$. As in the proof of 1) $\Rightarrow$ 2), this implies there is a concave increasing function F such that $U_\delta(x) = F(U(x))$ and that $F(x) < 0$ for $x < 0$. Therefore,

$$\liminf_{n\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{q_n}\log(-u^n_\delta(x)) \geq \liminf_{n\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{q_n}\log\left(-F(u^n_U(x))\right).$$

Here, $F(x) = U_\delta(U^{-1}(x)) = -(1/\delta)e^{-\delta U^{-1}(x)}$. Plugging this in gives

$$\liminf_{n\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{q_n}\log(-u^n_\delta(x)) \geq \liminf_{n\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{q_n}\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}e^{-\delta U^{-1}(u^n_U(x))}\right) = \liminf_{n\uparrow\infty}\frac{-\delta}{q_n}U^{-1}(u^n_U(x)).$$

Write $\beta_n = \frac{1}{q_n}\log(-u^n_U(x))$ and note that, by assumption, $\beta_n \to 0$. This gives

$$\liminf_{n\uparrow\infty} \frac{1}{q_n}\log(-u^n_\delta(x)) \geq \liminf_{n\uparrow\infty} \frac{-\delta}{q_n} U^{-1}\left(-e^{q_n\beta_n}\right).$$

The result then follows by Lemma 9.2.

□

Theorem 3.4 is now proved as an immediate consequence of the following Proposition:

Proposition 7.4. *Let $\alpha > 0$. Let Assumptions 2.1, 2.6 and 3.1 hold. Then*

a) If there exists a $K^* \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for some $x^* \in \mathbb{R}$ and $U^* \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$

$$\limsup_{n\uparrow\infty} p^n_{U^*}(x^*, q_n; h^n) \leq K^*, \tag{7.8}$$

then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$

$$\limsup_{n\uparrow\infty} p^n_U(x, q_n; h^n) \leq K^*. \tag{7.9}$$

b) If there exists a $K_* \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for some $x_* \in \mathbb{R}$ and $U_* \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$

$$\liminf_{n\uparrow\infty} p^n_{U_*}(x_*, q_n; h^n) \geq K_*, \tag{7.10}$$

then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$

$$\liminf_{n\uparrow\infty} p^n_U(x, q_n; h^n) \geq K_*. \tag{7.11}$$

Indeed, admitting Proposition 7.4:

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Let $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\hat{U} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and set

$$\overline{K} = \limsup_{n\uparrow\infty} p^n_{\hat{U}}(\hat{x}, q_n; h^n) \leq \|h\|_\infty; \qquad \underline{K} = \liminf_{n\uparrow\infty} p^n_{\hat{U}}(\hat{x}, q_n; h^n) \geq -\|h\|_\infty.$$

If, for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ it held that $\limsup_{n\uparrow\infty} p^n_U(x, q_n; h^n) \neq \overline{K}$ then the conclusion in *a*) of Proposition 7.4 would be violated. Similarly, if $\liminf_{n\uparrow\infty} p^n_U(x, q_n; h^n) \neq \underline{K}$ then the conclusion in *b*) of Proposition 7.4 would be violated. Thus, the result follows. □

It remains to prove Proposition 7.4.

Proof of Proposition 7.4. Proposition 7.4 relies upon the following variational representation for $p^n_U(x, q; h^n)$, proved in [Owen and Žitković, 2009, Proposition 7.2]:

$$p^n_U(x, q; h^n) = \frac{1}{q}\left(\inf_{\mathbb{Q}^n \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}}\left(\mathbb{E}^n\left[qh^n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right] + \inf_{y>0}\frac{1}{y}\left(\mathbb{E}^n\left[V\left(yZ^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right)\right]\right) + xy - u^n_U(x)\right)\right). \tag{7.12}$$

Remark 7.5. When comparing (7.12) with [Owen and Žitković, 2009, Proposition 7.2], note that by Lemma 7.2 it suffices to consider the class of measures $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}$ and hence the variational class is not changing with $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$.

The upper bound is handled first. Let $K^* \in \mathbb{R}$, $x^* \in \mathbb{R}$ and $U^* \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ be such that (7.8) holds. According to (7.12) and Lemma 10.5 with $Y = Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}$ (for any $\mathbb{Q}^n \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}$) and $u = u^n_{U^*}(x^*)$ it follows that for each n

$$p^n_{U^*}(x^*, q_n; h^n) = \inf_{\mathbb{Q}^n \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}} \left(\mathbb{E}^n \left[h^n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n} \right] + \frac{1}{q_n \hat{y}_n} \left(\mathbb{E}^n \left[V^* \left(\hat{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n} \right) \right] + x^* \hat{y}_n - u^n_{U^*}(x^*) \right) \right),$$

where $\hat{y}_n$, by (10.2), for all $\mathbb{Q}^n \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}$ satisfies

$$\frac{-u^n_{U^*}(x^*)}{K_{U^*}} \le \hat{y}_n \le -u^n_{U^*}(x^*) K_{U^*}. \tag{7.13}$$

Let $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Again, from (7.12) and Lemma 10.5 applied to $Y = Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}$ and $u = u^n_U(x)$

$$p^n_U(x, q_n; h^n) = \inf_{\mathbb{Q}^n \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}} \left(\mathbb{E}^n \left[h^n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n} \right] + \frac{1}{q_n \tilde{y}_n} \left(\mathbb{E}^n \left[V \left(\tilde{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n} \right) \right] + x \tilde{y}_n - u^n_U(x) \right) \right), \tag{7.14}$$

where the optimizer $\tilde{y}_n$ satisfies, for all $\mathbb{Q}^n \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}$,

$$\frac{-u^n_U(x)}{K_U} \le \tilde{y}_n \le -u^n_U(x) K_U. \tag{7.15}$$

Under Assumption 3.1, Lemma 3.2 combined with (7.13), (7.15) imply, uniformly over $\mathbb{Q}^n \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}$,

$$\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{q_n} \log(\hat{y}_n) = 0; \qquad \lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{q_n} \log(\tilde{y}_n) = 0. \tag{7.16}$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose $\mathbb{Q}^n \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}^n \left[h^n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n} \right] + \frac{1}{q_n \hat{y}_n} \left(\mathbb{E}^n \left[V^* \left(\hat{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n} \right) \right] + x^* \hat{y}_n - u^n_{U^*}(x^*) \right) \le p^n_{U^*}(x^*, q_n; h^n) + \varepsilon. \tag{7.17}$$

By (7.14)

$$\begin{aligned} p^n_U(x, q_n; h^n) &\le \mathbb{E}^n \left[h^n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n} \right] + \frac{1}{q_n \tilde{y}_n} \left(\mathbb{E}^n \left[V \left(\tilde{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n} \right) \right] + x \tilde{y}_n - u^n_U(x) \right), \\ &\le p^n_{U^*}(x^*, q_n; h^n) + \varepsilon - \frac{1}{q_n \hat{y}_n} \left(\mathbb{E}^n \left[V^* \left(\hat{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n} \right) \right] + x^* \hat{y}_n - u^n_{U^*}(x^*) \right) \\ &\qquad + \frac{1}{q_n \tilde{y}_n} \left(\mathbb{E}^n \left[V \left(\tilde{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n} \right) \right] + x \tilde{y}_n - u^n_U(x) \right). \end{aligned} \tag{7.18}$$

By applying Lemma 10.6 it follows that for $\varepsilon < \min \left\{ K_U^{-1}, K_{U^*}^{-1} \right\} / 2$ there are constants $K(\varepsilon, V^*)$, $K(\varepsilon, V)$ depending only on ε, U^* and U such that

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{\hat{y}_n} \mathbb{E}^n \left[V^* \left(\hat{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n} \right) \right] &\le 2K_{U^*} |\log(\hat{y}_n)| + K(\varepsilon, V^*) - (\alpha^{-1} - \varepsilon) \mathbb{E}^n \left[Z^{\mathbb{Q},n} \log(Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}) \right], \\ \frac{1}{\tilde{y}_n} \mathbb{E}^n \left[V \left(\tilde{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n} \right) \right] &\le 2K_U |\log(\tilde{y}_n)| + K(\varepsilon, V) + (\alpha^{-1} + \varepsilon) \mathbb{E}^n \left[Z^{\mathbb{Q},n} \log(Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}) \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{7.19}$$

Plugging this back into (7.18) gives

$$\begin{aligned} p^n_U(x, q_n; h^n) &\le p^n_{U^*}(x^*, q_n; h^n) + \varepsilon + \frac{1}{q_n} \left(2K_{U^*} |\log(\hat{y}_n)| + K(\varepsilon, V^*) - x^* + \frac{u^n_{U^*}(x^*)}{\hat{y}_n} \right) \\ &\qquad + \frac{1}{q_n} \left(2K_U |\log(\tilde{y}_n)| + K(\varepsilon, V) + x - \frac{u^n_U(x)}{\tilde{y}_n} \right) + \frac{2\varepsilon}{q_n} \mathbb{E}^n \left[Z^{\mathbb{Q},n} \log(Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}) \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{7.20}$$

Using (7.8), (7.13), (7.15) and (7.16) it follows that

$$\limsup_{n\uparrow\infty} p^n_U(x,q_n;h^n) \leq K^* + \varepsilon + 2\varepsilon \limsup_{n\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{q_n}\mathbb{E}^n\left[Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\log(Z^{\mathbb{Q},n})\right]. \tag{7.21}$$

Now, if

$$\limsup_{n\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{q_n}\mathbb{E}^n\left[Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\log(Z^{\mathbb{Q},n})\right] \leq K(\varepsilon), \tag{7.22}$$

for some $K(\varepsilon)$ such that $\varepsilon K(\varepsilon)\to 0$ as $\varepsilon\downarrow 0$ then the upper bound follows from (7.21) by letting $\varepsilon\downarrow 0$. To show (7.22), recall from (7.17) that

$$\begin{aligned} p^n_{U^*}(x^*,q_n;h^n)+\varepsilon &\geq \mathbb{E}^n\left[h^n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right] + \frac{1}{q_n\hat{y}_n}\left(\mathbb{E}^n\left[V^*\left(\hat{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right)\right] + x^*\hat{y}_n - u^n_{U^*}(x^*)\right),\\ &\geq -\|h\|_\infty + \frac{1}{q_n}\left(\frac{1}{\hat{y}_n}\mathbb{E}^n\left[V^*\left(\hat{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right)\right] + x^* - \frac{u^n_{U^*}(x^*)}{\hat{y}_n}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Using (7.19) gives

$$\begin{aligned} &p^n_{U^*}(x^*,q_n;h^n)+\varepsilon\\ &\quad\geq -\|h\|_\infty + \frac{1}{q_n}\left(-2K_{U^*}|\log(\hat{y}_n)| - K(\varepsilon,V^*) + (\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}^n\left[Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\log(Z^{\mathbb{Q},n})\right] + x^* - \frac{u^n_{U^*}(x^*)}{\hat{y}_n}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Using (7.8), (7.13), (7.15) and (7.16) again shows that

$$K^*+\varepsilon \geq -\|h\|_\infty + (\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)\limsup_{n\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{q_n}\mathbb{E}^n\left[Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\log(Z^{\mathbb{Q},n})\right].$$

So that

$$\limsup_{n\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{q_n}\mathbb{E}^n\left[Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\log(Z^{\mathbb{Q},n})\right] \leq \frac{K^*+\varepsilon+\|h\|_\infty}{\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon} := K(\varepsilon).$$

Since $\varepsilon K(\varepsilon)\to 0$ as $\varepsilon\downarrow 0$ the upper bound follows.

The lower bound follows in a similar manner. Let $K_*\in\mathbb{R}$, $x_*\in\mathbb{R}$ and $U_*\in\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ be such that (7.10) holds. Let $\varepsilon>0$. For n large enough, (7.12) and Lemma 10.5 applied to $Y=Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}$ (for any $\mathbb{Q}^n\in\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}$) and $u=u^n_{U_*}(x_*)$ give

$$K_*-\varepsilon \leq \inf_{\mathbb{Q}^n\in\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}}\left(\mathbb{E}^n\left[h^n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right] + \frac{1}{q_n\hat{y}_n}\left(\mathbb{E}^n\left[V_*\left(\hat{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right)\right] + x_*\hat{y}_n - u^n_{U_*}(x_*)\right)\right), \tag{7.23}$$

where now the $\hat{y}_n$ come from U_*. Let $x\in\mathbb{R}$ and $U\in\mathcal{U}_\alpha$. In light of Lemma 10.5 applied to $Y=Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}$ (for any $\mathbb{Q}^n\in\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}$) and $u=u^n_U(x)$ there is a $\mathbb{Q}^n\in\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}^n\left[h^n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right] + \frac{1}{q_n\tilde{y}_n}\left(\mathbb{E}^n\left[V\left(\tilde{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right)\right] + x\tilde{y}_n - u^n_U(x)\right) \leq p^n_U(x,q_n;h^n)+\varepsilon. \tag{7.24}$$

As before, (7.13), (7.15) and (7.16) hold for this choice of $\hat{y}_n, \tilde{y}_n$ and the rate of convergence can be uniformly bounded by that of $-u^n_U(x)$ and $-u^n_{U_*}(x_*)$ respectively. From (7.23)

$$\begin{aligned}
K_* - \varepsilon &\le \mathbb{E}^n\left[h^n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right] + \frac{1}{q_n\hat{y}_n}\left(\mathbb{E}^n\left[V_*\left(\hat{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right)\right] + x_*\hat{y}_n - u^n_{U_*}(x_*)\right),\\
&\le p^n_U(x,q_n;h^n) + \varepsilon - \frac{1}{q_n\tilde{y}_n}\left(\mathbb{E}^n\left[V\left(\tilde{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right)\right] + x\tilde{y}_n - u^n_U(x)\right)\\
&\quad + \frac{1}{q_n\hat{y}_n}\left(\mathbb{E}^n\left[V_*\left(\hat{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right)\right] + x_*\hat{y}_n - u^n_{U_*}(x_*)\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.25}$$

As in the upper bound case, by applying Lemma 10.6 it follows that for $\varepsilon < \min\left\{K_U^{-1}, K_{U_*}^{-1}\right\}/2$ there are constants $K(\varepsilon, V_*)$, $K(\varepsilon, V)$ depending only on ε, U_* and U such that

$$\begin{aligned}
-\frac{1}{\tilde{y}_n}\mathbb{E}^n\left[V\left(\tilde{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right)\right] &\le 2K_U|\log(\tilde{y}_n)| + K(\varepsilon,V) - (\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}^n\left[Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\log(Z^{\mathbb{Q},n})\right],\\
\frac{1}{\hat{y}_n}\mathbb{E}^n\left[V_*\left(\hat{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right)\right] &\le 2K_{U_*}|\log(\hat{y}_n)| + K(\varepsilon,V_*) + (\alpha^{-1}+\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}^n\left[Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\log(Z^{\mathbb{Q},n})\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{7.26}$$

Plugging this back into (7.25) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
K_* - \varepsilon &\le p^n_U(x,q_n;h^n) + \varepsilon + \frac{1}{q_n}\left(2K_U|\log(\tilde{y}_n)| + K(\varepsilon,V) - x + \frac{u^n_U(x)}{\tilde{y}_n}\right)\\
&\quad + \frac{1}{q_n}\left(2K_{U_*}|\log(\hat{y}_n)| + K(\varepsilon,V_*) + x_* - \frac{u^n_{U_*}(x_*)}{\hat{y}_n}\right) + \frac{2\varepsilon}{q_n}\mathbb{E}^n\left[Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\log(Z^{\mathbb{Q},n})\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{7.27}$$

Using (7.8), (7.13), (7.15) and (7.16) it follows that

$$K_* - \varepsilon \le \liminf_{n\uparrow\infty}\left(p^n_U(x,q_n;h^n) + \varepsilon + \frac{2\varepsilon}{q_n}\mathbb{E}^n\left[Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\log(Z^{\mathbb{Q},n})\right]\right). \tag{7.28}$$

As in the upper bound case, it is necessary to get a bound on

$$\frac{2\varepsilon}{q_n}\mathbb{E}^n\left[Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\log(Z^{\mathbb{Q},n})\right],$$

for large n. The bound is obtained by invoking Lemma 10.6 again. Specifically, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{2\varepsilon}{q_n}\mathbb{E}^n\left[Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\log(Z^{\mathbb{Q},n})\right] &= \frac{2\varepsilon}{q_n}\frac{\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon}{\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon}\mathbb{E}^n\left[Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\log(Z^{\mathbb{Q},n})\right],\\
&\le \frac{2\varepsilon}{q_n(\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)}\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{y}_n}\mathbb{E}^n\left[V(\tilde{y}_n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n})\right] + 2K_U|\log(\tilde{y}_n)| + K(\varepsilon,V)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Using (7.24)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{2\varepsilon}{q_n}\mathbb{E}^n\left[Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\log(Z^{\mathbb{Q},n})\right]\\
&\quad\le \frac{2\varepsilon}{q_n(\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)}\left(q_n\left(p^n_U(x,q_n;h^n) + \varepsilon - \mathbb{E}^n\left[h^n Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}\right]\right) - x + \frac{u^n_U(x)}{\tilde{y}_n} + 2K_U|\log(\tilde{y}_n)| + K(\varepsilon,V)\right),\\
&\quad\le \frac{2\varepsilon}{\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon}\left(p^n_U(x,q_n;h^n) + \varepsilon + \|h\|_\infty + \frac{1}{q_n}\left(-x + \frac{u^n_U(x)}{\tilde{y}_n} + 2K_U|\log(\tilde{y}_n)| + K(\varepsilon,V)\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging this back into (7.28) and using (7.8), (7.13), (7.15) and (7.16) yet again gives

$$\begin{aligned}K_* - \varepsilon &\le \liminf_{n\uparrow\infty}\left(\left(1+\frac{2\varepsilon}{\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon}\right)p_U^n(x,q_n;h^n)+\varepsilon+\frac{2\varepsilon}{\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon}\left(\varepsilon+\|h\|_\infty\right)\right),\\ &=\left(1+\frac{2\varepsilon}{\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon}\right)\liminf_{n\uparrow\infty}p_U^n(x,q_n;h^n)+\varepsilon+\frac{2\varepsilon}{\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon}\left(\varepsilon+\|h\|_\infty\right).\end{aligned} \tag{7.29}$$

The lower bound thus follows by letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. □

Proof of Proposition 3.7. If (3.8) holds for $\hat{U}$ then

$$\frac{1}{\overline{\alpha}} = \liminf_{x\uparrow\infty} -\frac{1}{x}\hat{U}^{-1}(-e^x) < \limsup_{x\uparrow\infty} -\frac{1}{x}\hat{U}^{-1}(-e^x) = \frac{1}{\underline{\alpha}}. \tag{7.30}$$

where $\hat{U}^{-1} : (-\infty, 0) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is the inverse of $\hat{U}$. Thus, there exists a sequence $q_n \uparrow \infty$ such that $-(1/q_n)\hat{U}^{-1}(-e^{q_n})$ does not converge. Using q_n, the constructed markets are based off the one period trinomial model. Specifically, let $u, h^u, h^m, h^d \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that

$$0 < u < 1; \quad \bar{h} := \frac{1}{2}(h^u + h^d); \quad h^m < \bar{h}; \quad \underline{\alpha} > \frac{1}{\bar{h} - h^m}. \tag{7.31}$$

Only the probability measure $\mathbb{P}^n$ changes with n. Specifically, set $\Omega = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{P}^\Omega$, $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\Omega, \emptyset\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}$. Let $S_0 = 1$ and $S_1(1) = 1 + u$, $S_1(2) = 1$, $S_1(3) = 1 - u$. As for the claim, let $h_1(1) = h^u$, $h_1(2) = h^m$, $h_1(3) = h^d$. Lastly, define $\mathbb{P}^n$ via

$$\mathbb{P}^n(1) = \mathbb{P}^n(3) = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - e^{-q_n}\right); \quad \mathbb{P}^n(2) = e^{-q_n}.$$

In (7.31), the first inequality ensures S_1 is positive, $\bar{h} \neq h^m$ ensures that h_1 is not replicable and $\bar{h} > h^m$ is assumed without loss of generality. The last inequality is needed to ensure the prices do not converge for $\hat{U}$.

Since S is a $\mathbb{P}^n$ martingale it is clear that Assumptions 2.1, 2.6, 3.1 hold. Note all the absolutely continuous martingale measures $\mathbb{Q}^n$ take the form $\mathbb{Q}^n(1) = \mathbb{Q}^n(3) = q$, $\mathbb{Q}^n(2) = 1 - 2q$ for some $0 \le q \le 1/2$ and all trading strategies H^n are constants. Using the first order conditions $U'(x + H^n(S_1 - S_0) + q_n h_1^n) = \lambda Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}$ it can be directly verified for any $U \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying conditions $i, ii)$ in Definition 2.4 that the value functions are given by

$$u_U^n(x) = U(x); \quad u_U^n(x, q_n; h_1) = (1 - e^{-q_n})U(x + q_n\bar{h}) + e^{-q_n}U(x + q_n h^m). \tag{7.32}$$

It is first shown that for all $\alpha > 0$, all $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ the prices $p_U^n(x, q_n; h_1)$ converge. In light of Corollary 3.5 it suffices to show convergence for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $U_\alpha(x) = -(1/\alpha)e^{-\alpha x}$. For ease of notation, set $\beta_n = p_{U_\alpha}^n(x, q_n; h_1)$. Using (7.32) and plugging in for U_α, the indifference pricing equation $u_{U_\alpha}^n(x) = u_{U_\alpha}^n(x - q_n\beta_n, q_n; h_1)$ yields

$$-\alpha\beta_n = \frac{1}{q_n}\log\left((1 - e^{-q_n})e^{-\alpha q_n\bar{h}} + e^{-q_n}e^{-\alpha q_n h^m}\right). \tag{7.33}$$

By [Dembo and Zeitouni, 1998, Lemma 1.2.15], $\limsup_{n\uparrow\infty}(-\alpha\beta_n) = -\alpha\min\left\{\bar{h}, \alpha^{-1} + h^m\right\}$. The positivity of the two terms within the log in (7.33) imply $\liminf_{n\uparrow\infty}(-\alpha\beta_n) \ge -\alpha\min\left\{\bar{h}, \alpha^{-1} + h^m\right\}$ and this yields the convergence of β_n to $\min\left\{\bar{h}, \alpha^{-1} + h^m\right\}$.

It is now shown that the prices $p^n_{\hat{U}}(x, q_n; h_1)$ cannot converge for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$. To this end, let $x \in \mathbb{R}$, set $\beta_n = p^n_{\hat{U}}(x, q_n; h_1)$ and assume that $\beta = \lim_{n\uparrow\infty} \beta_n$ exists. Clearly, $h^m \leq \beta \leq \bar{h}$. First, assume $\beta < \bar{h}$. Using (7.32), the indifference equation for β_n is

$$\hat{U}(x) = (1 - e^{-q_n})\hat{U}(x + q_n(\bar{h} - \beta_n)) + e^{-q_n}\hat{U}(x - q_n(\beta_n - h^m)). \tag{7.34}$$

Since $\hat{U}(\infty) = 0$, if $\beta < \bar{h}$ it clearly follows that $\hat{U}(x) = \lim_{n\uparrow\infty} e^{-q_n}\hat{U}(x - q_n(\beta_n - h^m))$. This implies $\hat{U}(x - q_n(\beta_n - h^m)) = \alpha_n\hat{U}(x)e^{q_n}$ for some $\alpha_n \to 1$. Thus

$$\beta_n = \frac{x}{q_n} + h^m - \frac{1}{q_n}\hat{U}^{-1}\left(\alpha_n\hat{U}(x)e^{q_n}\right),$$

which, after taking limits, yields

$$\beta - h^m = \lim_{n\uparrow\infty} -\frac{1}{q_n}\hat{U}^{-1}\left(\alpha_n\hat{U}(x)e^{q_n}\right).$$

By (7.30) the above equality implies $\beta - h^m > 0$. Thus, applying Lemma 9.5 with $U = \hat{U}$, $\gamma_n = \alpha_n\hat{U}(x)$, $\gamma = \hat{U}(x)$ and $l = \beta - h_m$ it follows that

$$\beta - h^m = \lim_{n\uparrow\infty} -\frac{1}{q_n}\hat{U}^{-1}\left(-e^{q_n}\right),$$

but this violates the assumption on q_n. Thus the only possible value for β is $\bar{h}$. But, if $\beta = \bar{h}$ then the last inequality in (7.31) is violated. To see this, let $\varepsilon > 0$ be small enough so that $\bar{h} - h^m - \varepsilon > 0$. For large enough n, $\beta_n \geq \bar{h} - \varepsilon$. The negativity of $U\hat{(x)}$ and (7.34) imply

$$-\hat{U}(x) \geq e^{-q_n}(-\hat{U}(x - q_n(\beta_n - h^m))) \geq e^{-q_n}\left(-\hat{U}(x - q_n(\bar{h} - h^m - \varepsilon))\right).$$

This gives, upon taking limits

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq -1 + \limsup_{n\uparrow\infty} \frac{1}{q_n}\log\left(-\hat{U}(x - q_n(\bar{h} - h^m - \varepsilon))\right), \\ &\geq -1 + \underline{\alpha}(\bar{h} - h^m - \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by (3.8). Taking $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ gives that $\underline{\alpha} \leq 1/(\bar{h} - h^m)$ but, this violates (7.31). Therefore, $\beta \neq \bar{h}$ and the proof is complete. ☐

8. Proofs from Section 4

Remark 8.1. **Remarks on Notation**. Since the probability space is not changing with n, unless explicitly mentioned otherwise, all expectations are taken with respect to $\mathbb{P}$. $Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}$ is still given as in (7.1) since $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}$ may be changing with n.

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Here, $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{n,a}$ is not changing with n so write $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^a = \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{1,a}$ and $Z^{\mathbb{Q}} = Z^{\mathbb{Q},n}$. Clearly

$$\inf_{\mathbb{Q}\in\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^a} \mathbb{E}\left[Z^{\mathbb{Q}}h(Y_T)\right] \geq \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\mathbb{P}}[h(Y_T)] = \inf_{y\in E} h(y),$$

where the last equality follows by the continuity of h and because for any open subinterval (a,b) of E, $\mathbb{P}\left[Y_T \in (a,b)\right] > 0$. To show the reverse inequality, let $m \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\mathbb{P}\left[h(Y_T) < m\right] > 0$. Set $A_m \in \mathcal{F}_T$ by $A_m = \{h(Y_T) < m\}$. Let $\delta > 0$ and consider the random variable

$$X = \frac{(1-\delta)1_{A_m} + \delta 1_{A_m^c}}{(1-\delta)\mathbb{P}\left[A_m\right] + \delta\mathbb{P}\left[A_m^c\right]}.$$

By assumption there exist $K > 1$ such that $1/K < X < K$ almost surely and clearly, $\mathbb{E}\left[X\right] = 1$. By the Martingale Representation Theorem [Karatzas and Shreve, 1991, Theorem 3.4.15] there exists a process η, adapted to the $\mathbb{P}$-augmented version of the right continuous enlargement of $\mathcal{F}^W$ such that

$$X = \mathcal{E}\left(\int_0^{\cdot} \eta_s dW_s\right)_T. \tag{8.1}$$

Consider the process Z defined by

$$Z_t := \mathcal{E}\left(\int_0^{\cdot} \eta_s dW_s - \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}}\int_0^{\cdot} \left(\lambda(Y_s) + \rho\eta_s\right) dB_s\right)_t; \quad 0 \le t \le T.$$

where $\bar{\rho} = \sqrt{1-\rho^2}$. It can be directly verified that ZS is a $\mathbb{P}$ local martingale. Furthermore, using the independence of W and Y from B it follows by taking iterative expectations that $\mathbb{E}\left[Z_T\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[X\right] = 1$ and hence $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}^a$ for $\mathbb{Q}$ defined by $Z^{\mathbb{Q}} = Z_T$. Furthermore, taking iterative expectations again yields

$$H\left(\mathbb{Q} \mid \mathbb{P}\right) = \mathbb{E}\left[X\left(\log X + \frac{1}{2\bar{\rho}^2}\int_0^T \left(\lambda(Y_t) + \rho\eta_t\right)^2 dt\right)\right].$$

Since λ and $\log(X)$ are bounded, it will follow that $\mathbb{Q} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^a$ if $\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T \eta_t^2 dt\right] < \infty$. To prove this, note that (8.1) gives

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T \eta_t^2 dt = \int_0^T \eta_t dW_t - \log X. \tag{8.2}$$

The bounded-ness of $\log(X)$ implies $\int_0^T \eta_t dW_t$ is bounded from below and hence by Fatou's Lemma $\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T \eta_t dW_t\right] \le 0$. But, by (8.2), this gives $\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T \eta_t^2 dt\right] < \infty$. Therefore, $H\left(\mathbb{Q} \mid \mathbb{P}\right) < \infty$ and $\mathbb{Q} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^a$. Using iterative conditioning

$$\mathbb{E}\left[Z^{\mathbb{Q}} h(Y_T)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[X h(Y_T)\right] \le \frac{(1-\delta)m\mathbb{P}\left[A_m\right] + \delta\sup_{y\in E}|h(y)|}{(1-\delta)\mathbb{P}\left[A_m\right] + \delta(1-\mathbb{P}\left[A_m\right])}.$$

Since this holds for each $\delta > 0$

$$\inf_{\mathbb{Q}\in\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^a} \mathbb{E}\left[Z^{\mathbb{Q}} h(Y_T)\right] \le \lim_{\delta\downarrow 0} \frac{(1-\delta)m\mathbb{P}\left[A_m\right] + \delta\sup_{y\in E}|h(y)|}{(1-\delta)\mathbb{P}\left[A_m\right] + \delta(1-\mathbb{P}\left[A_m\right])} = m,$$

proving the result as $m \downarrow \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[h(Y_T)\right]$.

□

Proof of Lemma 4.4. Under Assumption 4.1, the value function $u^n_{U_\alpha}(x,q;h^n)$ is given by [Tehranchi, 2004, Proposition 3.3]:

$$u^n_{U_\alpha}(x,q;h) = -\frac{e^{-\alpha x}}{\alpha}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[Z(\rho_n)\exp\left(-(1-\rho_n^2)\left(\alpha q h(Y_T) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T \lambda(Y_t)^2 dt\right)\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{1-\rho_n^2}}. \tag{8.3}$$

where $Z(\rho_n)$ is given in (4.6). From [İlhan et al., 2005, Theorem 3.1] it follows that the optimal $q_n(p)$ to (4.5) must satisfy the first order conditions

$$p = \frac{\partial_q u^n_{U_\alpha}(x-qp,q;h^n)}{\partial_x u^n_{U_\alpha}(x-qp,q;h^n)},$$

which, specified to the current setup, yields

$$p = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\rho_n)h(Y_T)e^{-\alpha q_n(p)(1-\rho_n^2)h(Y_T)-\frac{1}{2}(1-\rho_n^2)\int_0^T\lambda(Y_t)^2dt}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\rho_n)e^{-\alpha q_n(p)(1-\rho_n^2)h(Y_T)-\frac{1}{2}(1-\rho_n^2)\int_0^T\lambda(Y_t)^2dt}\right]}.$$

Setting $q_n(p)$ as in (4.7) it follows that β_n must solve (4.8). Defining the measure $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^n \sim \mathbb{P}$ via $d\hat{\mathbb{P}}^n/d\mathbb{P} = Z(\rho_n)$, (4.8) takes the form

$$p = \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\hat{\mathbb{P}}^n}\left[h(Y_T)e^{-\beta_n h(Y_T)-\frac{1}{2}(1-\rho_n^2)\int_0^T\lambda(Y_t)^2dt}\right]}{\mathbb{E}^{\hat{\mathbb{P}}^n}\left[e^{-\beta_n h(Y_T)-\frac{1}{2}(1-\rho_n^2)\int_0^T\lambda(Y_t)^2dt}\right]}.$$

That such a β_n exists and is unique now follows from Lemma 10.7 by setting $\mathbb{P} = \hat{\mathbb{P}}^n$, $X = h(Y_T)$ and $Y = -(1/2)(1-\rho_n^2)\int_0^T\lambda(Y_t)^2dt$; and noting that that $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^n \sim \mathbb{P}$. ☐

Proof of Proposition 4.5. Lemma 10.8 with $X = h(Y_T)$, $Y = -(1/2)(1-\rho^2)\int_0^T\lambda(Y_t)^2dt$, $Y_n = -(1/2)(1-\rho_n^2)\int_0^T\lambda(Y_t)^2dt$, $Z_n = Z(\rho_n)$ and $Z = Z(\rho)$ gives that $(\beta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ from (4.8) converge to β_* from (4.11). (4.7) thus immediately gives (4.10).

As for the statements regarding $\sup_n|q_n(p)|$, assume that $|\rho| = 1$ and $p \neq \hat{p}$. By Lemma 10.7 it follows that $\beta_* \neq 0$ and hence by (4.10), $\sup_n|q_n(p)| = \infty$. Now, assume that either $|\rho| < 1$ or that $p = \hat{p}$. If $|\rho| < 1$ then by (4.10), $\sup_n|q_n(p)| < \infty$. If $|\rho| = 1$ but $p = \hat{p}$ then, since $\beta_* = 0$, it is not immediately clear from (4.7) if $\sup_n|q_n(p)| < \infty$. However, this is indeed the case, as is now shown. Without loss of generality, assume $\rho = 1$ and set $Z = Z(1)$ from (4.6). For $\rho_n < 1$ note that

$$Z(\rho_n) = Z^{\rho_n}\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\rho_n(1-\rho_n)\int_0^T\lambda(Y_t)^2dt\right).$$

Substituting this into (4.8)

$$\hat{p} = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[Z^{\rho_n}h(Y_T)\exp\left(-\beta_n h(Y_T) - \frac{1}{2}(1-\rho_n)\int_0^T\lambda(Y_t)^2dt\right)\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[Z^{\rho_n}\exp\left(-\beta_n h(Y_T) - \frac{1}{2}(1-\rho_n)\int_0^T\lambda(Y_t)^2dt\right)\right]}.$$

Since $\lambda(y)$ is bounded, for all $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[Z^\rho\right] < \infty$. Thus, Lemma 10.9 applied to $X = h(Y_T)$, $Z = Z$, $Y = (1/2)\int_0^T\lambda(Y_t)^2dt$ and $p = \hat{p}$ shows $\beta(\rho_n) = \beta_n$ and $\beta(1) = \beta_* = 0$. Furthermore, since $\beta_n \to 0$, part ii) of Lemma 10.9 proves that for n large enough

$$|\beta_n| = |\beta(\rho_n)| = \left|\int_{\rho_n}^{1} \beta'(\rho)d\rho\right| \leq 2|\beta'(1)|(1-\rho_n).$$

Therefore, from (4.7)

$$|q_n(\hat{p})| = \frac{|\beta_n|}{\alpha(1-\rho_n^2)} \leq \frac{2|\beta'(1)|(1-\rho_n)}{\alpha(1-\rho_n^2)} = \frac{2|\beta'(1)|}{\alpha(1+\rho_n)} \leq \frac{2|\beta'(1)|}{\alpha},$$

proving that $\sup_n |q_n(\hat{p})| < \infty$. ☐

Proof of Proposition 4.6. By Corollary 3.5 it suffices to show (4.16) for $x^* = 0$ and the exponential utility U_α. Using the definition of $p^n_{U_\alpha}(x,q;h^n)$ in (2.14) and the formula for $u^n_{U_\alpha}(x,q;h)$ in (8.3) (for $h(Y_T)$ and the 0 claim), one has for $q_n = \gamma/(1-\rho_n^2)$

$$p^n_{U_\alpha}(0,q_n;h) = -\frac{1}{\alpha\gamma}\log\left(\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\rho_n)e^{-\alpha\gamma h(Y_T)-\frac{1}{2}(1-\rho_n^2)\int_0^T\lambda(Y_t)^2dt}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\rho_n)e^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\rho_n^2)\int_0^T\lambda(Y_t)^2dt}\right]}\right).$$

The result now follows by the dominated convergence theorem. ☐

Proof of Proposition 4.7. From [İlhan et al., 2005, Section 5] it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} p^n_{U_\alpha}(x,q_n(p);h) &= p + \frac{1-\rho_n^2}{\beta_n}\left(H\left(\mathbb{Q}^{n,q_n(p)} \mid \mathbb{P}\right) - H\left(\mathbb{Q}^{n,0} \mid \mathbb{P}\right)\right), \\ &= p + \frac{1-\rho_n^2}{\beta_n}\left(H\left(\mathbb{Q}^{n,q_n(p)} \mid \mathbb{Q}^{n,0}\right) - \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^{n,q_n(p)}}{d\mathbb{P}}\log\left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^{n,0}}{d\mathbb{P}}\right)\right]\right). \end{aligned}$$

By construction, $\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} p^n_{U_\alpha}(x,q_n(p);h) - p = p_i(\beta_*) - p_m(\beta_*)$. Furthermore

$$\log\left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^{n,0}}{d\mathbb{P}}\right) = -\rho_n\int_0^T\lambda(Y_t)dW_t - \frac{1}{2}\rho_n^2\int_0^T\lambda(Y_t)^2dt.$$

Since λ is bounded

$$\lim_{n\uparrow\infty}\frac{1-\rho_n^2}{\beta_n}\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^{n,q_n(p)}}{d\mathbb{P}}\log\left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^{n,0}}{d\mathbb{P}}\right)\right] = 0,$$

proving the result. ☐

9. PROPERTIES OF U AND V FOR $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$

The following lemmas state some asymptotic properties of U, U^{-1} and V for any $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$.

Lemma 9.1. *Let $\alpha > 0$, $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and refer to (2.4),(2.5) and (2.3) for the notation. Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b > 0$. Then*

$$-\alpha = \lim_{x\downarrow-\infty}\frac{1}{bx}\log(-U(a+bx)), \tag{9.1}$$

$$-K_U \leq \liminf_{x\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{bx}\log(-U(a+bx)) \leq \limsup_{x\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{bx}\log(-U(a+bx)) \leq -\frac{1}{K_U}, \tag{9.2}$$

and

$$AE_{-\infty}(U) := \liminf_{x\downarrow-\infty} \frac{xU'(x)}{U(x)} = \infty; \qquad AE_{\infty}(U) := \limsup_{x\uparrow\infty} \frac{xU'(x)}{U(x)} \leq 0. \tag{9.3}$$

Proof of Lemma 9.1. (9.1) is obvious given (2.5). Since $U'(0) = 1, \lim_{x\uparrow\infty} U(x) = 0$ it easily follows from (2.4) that

$$\lim_{x\uparrow\infty} U'(x) = 0; \quad \lim_{x\downarrow-\infty} U(x) = -\infty; \quad \lim_{x\downarrow-\infty} xU'(x) = -\infty; \quad \lim_{x\uparrow\infty} xU'(x) = 0. \tag{9.4}$$

Therefore, the statements regarding U in (9.2) follow by applying l'Hospital's rule (see [Rudin, 1976, Chapter 5] for l'Hospital's rule with $\limsup, \liminf$) twice and using (2.4). The statement regarding $\mathrm{AE}_{\infty}(U)$ is obvious since $U < 0$. As for the statement regarding $\mathrm{AE}_{-\infty}(U)$, (9.4) implies l'Hospital's rule may be used, yielding

$$\lim_{x\downarrow-\infty} \frac{xU'(x)}{U(x)} = \lim_{x\downarrow-\infty} 1 - x\alpha_U(x) = \infty.$$

□

Lemma 9.2. *Let $\alpha > 0$, $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and set U^{-1} as its inverse. Let $\beta_n \to 0$ and $x_n \to \infty$. Then*

$$\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} \frac{1}{x_n} U^{-1}\left(-e^{x_n\beta_n}\right) = 0 \tag{9.5}$$

Proof of Lemma 9.2. By way of contradiction, let $\varepsilon > 0$ and assume there exists a subsequence (still labeled x_n, β_n) such that for all n, $(1/x_n)U^{-1}\left(-e^{x_n\beta_n}\right) \geq \varepsilon/2$. Upon inversion of U this implies $\beta_n \leq (1/x_n)\log\left(-U\left(\varepsilon x_n/2\right)\right)$, or that, as $n \uparrow \infty$,

$$\limsup_{n\uparrow\infty} \frac{1}{x_n} \log\left(-U\left(\frac{\varepsilon x_n}{2}\right)\right) \geq 0.$$

But, this violates (9.2) at $a = 0$ and $b = \varepsilon/2$. Similarly, assume there exists a subsequence (still labeled x_n, β_n) such that for all n, $(1/x_n)U^{-1}\left(-e^{x_n\beta_n}\right) \leq -\varepsilon/2$. This implies $-(2\beta_n/\varepsilon) \leq -(2/(\varepsilon x_n))\log\left(-U\left(-\varepsilon x_n/2\right)\right)$. Using (9.1) (at $a = 0$, $b = \varepsilon/2$, $x = -x_n$), this gives as $n \uparrow \infty$ that $0 \leq -\alpha$. Therefore, the result holds. □

Lemma 9.3. *Let $\alpha > 0$, $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and refer to* (2.4),(2.5) *and* (2.3) *for the notation. Define V as in* (2.6)*. Then $V \in C^2(0,\infty)$ is strictly convex. Furthermore,*

$$\frac{1}{\alpha} = \lim_{y\uparrow\infty} \frac{V(y)}{y\log y - y}, \tag{9.6}$$

$$\frac{1}{K_U} \leq \liminf_{y\downarrow 0} \frac{V(y)}{y\log y - y} \leq \limsup_{y\downarrow 0} \frac{V(y)}{y\log y - y} \leq K_U, \tag{9.7}$$

and, for all $y > 0$,

$$\frac{1}{K_U} \leq \frac{yV'(y) - V(y)}{y} \leq K_U. \tag{9.8}$$

Remark 9.4. Note that (9.7) implies $\lim_{y\downarrow 0} V(y) = 0$ and hence V can be continuously extended to 0 by setting $V(0) = 0$.

Proof of Lemma 9.3. Since U' is strictly decreasing with $\lim_{x\downarrow\infty} U'(x) = \infty$ and $\lim_{x\uparrow\infty} U'(x) = 0$ it follows that $(U')^{-1}$ exists on $(0,\infty)$ and that $\lim_{y\downarrow 0}(U')^{-1}(y) = \infty$, $\lim_{y\uparrow\infty}(U')^{-1}(y) = -\infty$. Set $I(y) = (U')^{-1}(y)$. Since U is C^2 and strictly concave it follows that the map $y \mapsto I(y)$ is C^1 and hence so is $V'(y) = -I(y)$. This proves that $V \in C^2(0,\infty)$. The strict concavity of U yields the strict convexity of V. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. By (2.5) there exists some K_ε such that for $x < -K_\varepsilon$

$$-e^{-(\alpha+\varepsilon)x} \le U(x) \le -e^{-(\alpha-\varepsilon)x}.$$

Thus, for y large enough

$$V(y) \le \max\left\{\sup_{x\le -K_\varepsilon}\left(-e^{-(\alpha-\varepsilon)x} - xy\right), \sup_{x>-K_\varepsilon}\left(U(x) - xy\right)\right\} = \frac{y}{\alpha-\varepsilon}\left(\log\left(\frac{y}{\alpha-\varepsilon}\right) - 1\right).$$

This gives

$$\limsup_{y\uparrow\infty} \frac{V(y)}{y(\log y - 1)} \le \frac{1}{\alpha-\varepsilon}.$$

Similarly, for y large enough

$$V(y) \ge \max\left\{\sup_{x\le -K_\varepsilon}\left(-e^{-(\alpha+\varepsilon)x} - xy\right), \sup_{x>-K_\varepsilon}\left(U(x) - xy\right)\right\} = \frac{y}{\alpha+\varepsilon}\left(\log\left(\frac{y}{\alpha+\varepsilon}\right) - 1\right).$$

This gives

$$\liminf_{y\uparrow\infty} \frac{V(y)}{y(\log y - 1)} \ge \frac{1}{\alpha+\varepsilon}.$$

(9.6) follows by taking $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. As for (9.7), at $x = I(y)$,

$$V(y) = U(U'(x)) - xU'(x). \tag{9.9}$$

Since $\lim_{y\downarrow 0} I(y) = \infty$ it holds from (9.4) that $\lim_{y\downarrow 0} V(y) = 0$ and hence V can be continuously extended to 0 by setting $V(0) = 0$. Furthermore, $V'(y) = -I(y)$ so that $\lim_{y\downarrow 0} V'(y) = -\infty$. Now, (9.7) follows by two applications of l'Hospital's rule noting that

$$yV''(y) = -\frac{U'(I(y))}{U''(I(y))}, \tag{9.10}$$

and so $K_U^{-1} \le yV''(y) \le K_U$ for $y > 0$. As for (9.8), $\lim_{y\downarrow 0} yV'(y) - V(y) = \lim_{y\downarrow 0} -U(I(y)) = 0$. (9.8) thus follows since by (9.10)

$$\frac{1}{K_U} \le \frac{d}{dy}\left(yV'(y) - V(y)\right) \le K_U.$$

□

Lemma 9.5. *Let $U \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ satisfy conditions $i, ii)$ in Definition 2.4 and set U^{-1} as its inverse. Let $\gamma_n \to \gamma$ for $\gamma < 0$. Let $r_n \uparrow \infty$ and assume that*

$$\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} -\frac{1}{r_n} U^{-1}\left(\gamma_n e^{r_n}\right) = l \tag{9.11}$$

for some $l > 0$. Then

$$\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} -\frac{1}{r_n} U^{-1}\left(-e^{r_n}\right) = l. \tag{9.12}$$

Proof of Lemma 9.5. Write $U(x) = -e^{-f(x)}$ and note that U satisfying conditions $i, ii)$ in Definition 2.4 implies $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$, $1 = f'(0)e^{-f(0)}$, $f'(x) > 0$, $\lim_{x\uparrow\infty} f(x) = 0$ and

$$\frac{1}{K_U} \leq f'(x) - \frac{f''(x)}{f'(x)} \leq K_U.$$

Since $f'(x) = -U'(x)/U(x)$, l'Hospital's rule and (2.4) give

$$\frac{1}{K_U} \leq \liminf_{x\downarrow-\infty} f'(x) \leq \limsup_{x\downarrow-\infty} f'(x) \leq K_U. \tag{9.13}$$

This implies $f(-\infty) = -\infty$ so that f^{-1} maps $(-\infty, 0)$ into $\mathbb{R}$. Set $g = f^{-1}$. By construction $U^{-1}(z) = g(-\log(-z))$ for $z < 0$. (9.11) thus implies

$$\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} -\frac{1}{r_n} g\left(-\log(-\gamma_n) - r_n\right) = l,$$

which gives that (note : $r_n \uparrow \infty$ implies $g(-r_n) \downarrow -\infty$ so there is no problem dividing by $g(-r_n)$):

$$\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} -\frac{1}{r_n} g(-r_n) \frac{g\left(-\log(-\gamma_n) - r_n\right)}{g(-r_n)} = l. \tag{9.14}$$

Now,

$$\frac{g\left(-\log(-\gamma_n) - r_n\right)}{g(-r_n)} = 1 + \frac{1}{g(-r_n)} \int_{-r_n}^{-r_n-\log(-\gamma_n)} g'(z)dz. \tag{9.15}$$

Since $g'(z) = 1/f'(g(z))$ and since $z \to -\infty$ implies $g(z) \to -\infty$ it follows by (9.13) that for n large enough there is some $K > 0$ such that

$$\left| \int_{-r_n}^{-r_n-\log(-\gamma_n)} g'(z)dz \right| \leq K|\log(-\gamma_n)|. \tag{9.16}$$

The claim follows using (9.16) and the fact that $\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} g(-r_n) = -\infty$ in (9.15) and then (9.14). $\square$

10. Supporting Generic Lemmas

Remark 10.1. **Remarks on Notation** Throughout this section, $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ represents a generic probability space. All random variables (e.g. X, Y, Z) are assumed to be in $L^0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and all expectations, unless explicitly stated otherwise, are with respect to $\mathbb{P}$. Inequalities regarding random variables are assumed to hold $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely. For and $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$, denote by V the function in (2.6).

Lemma 10.2. *Let $Y \geq 0$. The following are equivalent:*

1) $\mathbb{E}[V(yY)] < \infty$ for all $\alpha > 0$, all $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and all $y > 0$.

2) $\mathbb{E}[V(yY)] < \infty$ for some $\alpha > 0$, some $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and some $y > 0$.

3) $\mathbb{E}[Y \log Y] < \infty$.

Remark 10.3. In Lemma 10.2, $Y \log Y$ and $V(yY)$ are defined to be 0 on $\{Y = 0\}$. Clearly, Lemma 10.2 shows that $\mathbb{E}[V(yY)] < \infty$ for some $y > 0$ implies $Y \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. As seen in the proof, Lemma 10.2 does not require (2.5); rather, it just uses (2.4) and $U'(0) = 1, U(\infty) = 0$.

Proof of Lemma 10.2. Let $\alpha > 0$ and $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$. Using $U'(0) = 1, U(\infty) = 0$ and (2.4) it easily follows that

$$-K_U - \frac{1}{K_U} e^{-K_U x} \leq U(x) \leq K_U - K_U e^{-x/K_U},$$

from whence it follows that

$$- K_U + \frac{z}{K_U}(\log z - 1) \leq V(z) \leq K_U + K_U z(\log z - 1). \tag{10.1}$$

The equivalences readily follow from (10.1) since for all $K \in \mathbb{R}$,$z \geq 0$, $z \leq Kz + z \log z + e^{-K}$.

$\square$

Lemma 10.4. *Let $\alpha > 0$ and $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$. Let $Y \geq 0$. If $\mathbb{E}[V(Y)] < \infty$ then the map $y \mapsto \mathbb{E}[V(yY)]$ is differentiable with derivative $\mathbb{E}[YV'(yY)]$. If $Y \not\equiv 0$ then the map is strictly convex.*

Proof of Lemma 10.4. Recall from Lemma 10.2 that $\mathbb{E}[V(Y)] < \infty$ implies $\mathbb{E}[V(yY)] < \infty$ for all $y > 0$. Let $y > 0$ and consider the function

$$f(\varepsilon, z) := \frac{V((y+\varepsilon)z) - V(yz)}{\varepsilon} - \frac{V(yz)}{y}; \qquad \varepsilon > 0, z \geq 0.$$

Note that $f(\varepsilon, 0) = 0$. $V \in C^2(0,\infty)$ implies $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} f(\varepsilon, z) = zV'(yz) - V(yz)/y$. Furthermore, the convexity of V gives

$$\begin{aligned} f(\varepsilon, z) &\leq V((1+y)z) - V(yz) - \frac{V(yz)}{y}, \\ f_z(\varepsilon, z) &= \frac{(y+\varepsilon)V'((y+\varepsilon)z) - yV'(yz)}{\varepsilon} - V'(yz) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $f(\varepsilon, z) \geq 0$ and the result follows by the dominated convergence theorem applied to $f(\varepsilon, Y)$. The strict convexity of $y \mapsto \mathbb{E}[V(yY)]$ in the case $Y \not\equiv 0$ follows from that of V.

$\square$

Lemma 10.5. *Let $\alpha > 0$ and $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$. Let $Y \geq 0$ be such that $\mathbb{E}[Y] = 1$, $\mathbb{E}[V(Y)] < \infty$. Let $u < 0$ and consider the function*

$$h(y) := \frac{1}{y}\left(\mathbb{E}[V(yY)] + xy - u\right); \quad y > 0.$$

Then, there exists a unique $\hat{y} > 0$ *which minimizes* h*. With* K_U *as in* (2.4)*,*

$$\frac{-u}{K_U} \leq \hat{y} \leq -uK_U. \tag{10.2}$$

Proof of Lemma 10.5. By Lemma 10.4 it follows that

$$h'(y) = \frac{1}{y^2}\left(\mathbb{E}\left[yYV'(yY) - V(yY)\right] + u\right).$$

Consider the quantity

$$y^2h'(y) - u = \mathbb{E}\left[yYV'(yY) - V(yY)\right]. \tag{10.3}$$

By (9.8), the dominated convergence theorem implies this is a continuous, strictly increasing function of y such that

$$\lim_{y\downarrow 0} y^2h'(y) - u = 0; \qquad \lim_{y\uparrow\infty} y^2h'(y) - u = \infty.$$

Thus, there exists a unique $\hat{y}$ such that $\hat{y}^2h'(\hat{y}) - u = -u > 0$. Clearly this $\hat{y}$ satisfies $h'(\hat{y}) = 0$, and is the unique minimizer of $h(y)$ on $(0,\infty)$. Using (10.3) and $\mathbb{E}[Y] = 1$ it follows from (9.8) that $\hat{y}/K_U \leq -u \leq K_U\hat{y}$ from which (10.2) follows. ☐

Lemma 10.6. *Let* $\alpha > 0$, $U \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ *and* $y > 0$*. Recall the notation in* (2.4) *and* (2.5)*. Let* $Y \geq 0$ *be such that* $\mathbb{E}[Y] = 1$*. For every* $0 < \varepsilon < K_U^{-1}/2$ *there exists some* $K(\varepsilon, V)$ *which does not depend on either* y *or* Y *such that*

$$\frac{1}{y}\mathbb{E}\left[V(yY)\right] \leq 2K_U|\log y| + K(\varepsilon, V) + \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} + \varepsilon\right)\mathbb{E}\left[Y\log Y\right], \tag{10.4}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{y}\mathbb{E}\left[V(yY)\right] \geq -2K_U|\log y| - K(\varepsilon, V) + \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \varepsilon\right)\mathbb{E}\left[Y\log Y\right]. \tag{10.5}$$

Proof of Lemma 10.6. Note that by (2.4), $U'(0) = 1, U(\infty) = 0$ it follows from l'Hospital's rule that $K_U^{-1} \leq \alpha \leq K_U$ which implies $K_U^{-1} \leq \alpha^{-1} \leq K_U$. Let $0 < \varepsilon < K_U^{-1}/2$. By assumption, this means $\varepsilon \leq K_U$ and gives

$$\alpha^{-1} + \varepsilon \leq 2K_U; \qquad 0 < \alpha^{-1} - \varepsilon + K_U < 2K_U. \tag{10.6}$$

By (9.6) and (9.7) there is some small $\delta > 0$ depending only on ε and V such that

$$z \geq \delta^{-1} \Longrightarrow \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \varepsilon\right)z(\log z - 1) \leq V(z) \leq \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} + \varepsilon\right)z(\log z - 1),$$
$$z \leq \delta \Longrightarrow K_U z(\log z - 1) \leq V(z) \leq \frac{1}{K_U}z(\log z - 1) \leq 0.$$

The upper bound is handled first.

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{y}V(yY)1_{\{yY>\delta^{-1}\}} &\leq \frac{1}{y}(\alpha^{-1}+\varepsilon)yY(\log(yY) - 1)1_{\{yY>\delta^{-1}\}},\\ &\leq (\alpha^{-1}+\varepsilon)|\log y|Y + (\alpha^{-1}+\varepsilon)Y(\log Y - 1) - (\alpha^{-1}+\varepsilon)Y(\log Y - 1)1_{\{yY\leq\delta^{-1}\}},\\ &\leq (\alpha^{-1}+\varepsilon)|\log y|Y + (\alpha^{-1}+\varepsilon)Y(\log Y - 1) + (\alpha^{-1}+\varepsilon).\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality it was used that $z(\log z - 1) \geq -1$. Similarly, since V is convex and δ assumed small

$$\frac{1}{y}V(yY)1_{\{\delta \leq yY \leq \delta^{-1}\}} \leq \frac{1}{y}\max\left\{-V(\delta), V(\delta^{-1})\right\}1_{\{\delta \leq yY \leq \delta^{-1}\}} \leq \frac{Y}{\delta}\max\left\{-V(\delta), V(\delta^{-1})\right\}.$$

Lastly, $(1/y)V(yY)1_{\{yY<\delta\}} \leq 0$. Putting these three inequalities together gives

$$\frac{1}{y}\mathbb{E}\left[V(yY)\right] \leq (\alpha^{-1}+\varepsilon)|\log y| + (\alpha^{-1}+\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}\left[Y\log Y\right] + \delta^{-1}\max\left\{-V(\delta), V(\delta^{-1})\right\}. \tag{10.7}$$

The lower bound is now handled.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{y}V(yY)1_{\{yY>\delta^{-1}\}} &\geq \frac{1}{y}(\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)yY(\log(yY)-1)1_{\{yY>\delta^{-1}\}},\\
&= (\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)Y(\log(yY)-1) - (\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)Y(\log(yY)-1)1_{\{yY\leq\delta^{-1}\}},\\
&\geq -(\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)|\log y|Y + (\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)Y\log Y - (\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)Y - (\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)Y(\log(\delta^{-1})-1),\\
&= -(\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)|\log y|Y + (\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)Y\log Y - (\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)Y\log(\delta^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, since $U(0)<0$,

$$\frac{1}{y}V(yY)1_{\{\delta\leq yY\leq\delta^{-1}\}} \geq \frac{1}{y}U(0)1_{\{\delta\leq yY\leq\delta^{-1}\}} \geq \frac{Y}{\delta}U(0).$$

Lastly, since $z(\log z - 1) \geq -1$.

$$\frac{1}{y}V(yY)1_{\{yY<\delta\}} \geq \frac{1}{y}K_U yY(\log(yY)-1)1_{\{yY<\delta\}} \geq -K_U|\log y|Y - K_U.$$

Putting these three inequalities together gives

$$\frac{1}{y}\mathbb{E}\left[V(yY)\right] \geq -(\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon+K_U)|\log y| + (\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}\left[Y\log Y\right] - (\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)\log(\delta^{-1}) + \delta^{-1}U(0) - K_U. \tag{10.8}$$

Using (10.6) the claim follows with

$$K(\varepsilon, V) = \delta^{-1}\max\left\{-V(\delta), V(\delta^{-1})\right\} + (\alpha^{-1}-\varepsilon)\log(\delta^{-1}) - \delta^{-1}U(0) + K_U.$$

□

Lemma 10.7. *Let X, Y be such that, for some $K>0$, $|X|, |Y| \leq K$. For $\beta\in\mathbb{R}$, consider the map*

$$g(\beta) := \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[Xe^{-\beta X+Y}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\beta X+Y}\right]}.$$

Then, unless X is almost surely constant, g is strictly decreasing with

$$\lim_{\beta\downarrow-\infty} g(\beta) = \underset{\mathbb{P}}{ess\ sup}\left[X\right]; \qquad \lim_{\beta\uparrow\infty} g(\beta) = \underset{\mathbb{P}}{ess\ inf}\left[X\right].$$

Thus, for every $p \in (ess\ inf_{\mathbb{P}}\left[X\right], ess\ sup_{\mathbb{P}}\left[X\right])$, there exists a unique $\beta(p)$ such that $g(\beta(p)) = p$.

Proof of Lemma 10.7. Since $|X| \leq K$, there is some ε_K such that for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_K$, $\left|(1/\varepsilon)(e^{-\varepsilon X} - 1)\right| \leq 2K$. Since $|Y| \leq K$ the bounded convergence theorem implies g is differentiable with

$$g'(\beta) = -\mathrm{Var}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[X\right]; \qquad \frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}{d\mathbb{P}} = \frac{e^{-\beta X + Y}}{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[e^{-\beta X + Y}\right]}.$$

Thus, since $\tilde{\mathbb{P}} \sim \mathbb{P}$, $g(\beta)$ is strictly decreasing unless X almost surely constant. Clearly, $g(\beta) \geq \text{ess inf}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[X\right]$. As for the other direction, let m be such that $\mathbb{P}\left[X < m\right] > 0$. For $\beta > 0$

$$g(\beta) = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[Xe^{-\beta(X-m)+Y}(1_{X<m} + 1_{X\geq m})\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\beta(X-m)+Y}(1_{X<m} + 1_{X\geq m})\right]} \leq m + \frac{Ke^K}{\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\beta(X-m)+Y}1_{X<m}\right]}.$$

Since on $\{X < m\}$, $\lim_{\beta\uparrow\infty} e^{-\beta(X-m)+Y} = \infty$, Fatou's Lemma proves $\limsup_{\beta\uparrow\infty} g(\beta) \leq m$. Taking $m \downarrow \text{ess inf}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[X\right]$ gives the result. The result for $\lim_{\beta\downarrow-\infty} g(\beta)$ follows by a similar argument.

□

Lemma 10.8. *Let $X, Y, (Y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be such that, for some $K > 0$, $|X|, |Y|, \sup_n |Y_n| \leq K$. Assume that $Y_n \to Y$ almost surely. Let $(Z_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, Z$ be strictly positive and such that*

$$Z_n \to Z \text{ almost surely}; \qquad 1 = \mathbb{E}\left[Z\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[Z_n\right] \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Assume X is not almost surely constant and let $p \in (\text{ess inf}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[X\right], \text{ess sup}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[X\right])$. Then

i) For each n there is a unique β_n satisfying

$$p = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[Z_n X e^{-\beta_n X + Y_n}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[Z_n e^{-\beta_n X + Y_n}\right]}. \tag{10.9}$$

ii) $\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} \beta_n = \beta$ where β is the unique $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ solving

$$p = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[Z X e^{-\beta X + Y}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[Z e^{-\beta X + Y}\right]}. \tag{10.10}$$

Proof of Lemma 10.8. Set $\mathbb{P}^n$ via $d\mathbb{P}^n/d\mathbb{P} = Z_n$. Part *i)* now follows from Lemma 10.7 applied to $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}^n$, $X = X$ and $Y = Y_n$, noting that the strict positivity of Z_n implies $\mathbb{P}^n \sim \mathbb{P}$.

As for part *ii)* note that if some subsequence $\beta_{n_k} \to \beta$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ then by the dominated convergence theorem, β satisfies (10.10). Since by Lemma 10.7 there can be only one such β, $\beta_n \to \beta$ if $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} |\beta_n| < \infty$. Assume, by way of contradiction, that there is some subsequence β_{n_k} such that $\beta_{n_k} \to \infty$. Let m be such that $\mathbb{P}\left[X < m\right] > 0$ and note

$$p = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[Z_n X e^{-\beta_n(X-m)+Y_n}(1_{X<m} + 1_{X\geq m})\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[Z_n e^{-\beta(X-m)+Y_n}(1_{X<m} + 1_{X\geq m})\right]} \leq m + \frac{Ke^K}{\mathbb{E}\left[Z_n e^{-\beta_n(X-m)+Y_n}1_{X<m}\right]}.$$

As $\beta_n \to \infty$, $e^{-\beta_n}(X - m)$ converges to ∞ on $\{X < m\}$ and hence by Fatou's Lemma, $p < m$. This is a contradiction since m was any constant such that $\mathbb{P}\left[X < m\right] > 0$ and $p > \text{ess inf}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[X\right]$. Thus the sequence $(\beta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded from above. That $(\beta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded from below follows by a similar argument.

□

Lemma 10.9. *Let X, Y be such that, for some $K > 0$, $|X|, |Y| \leq K$. Assume X is not almost surely constant. Let Z be strictly positive and such that $\mathbb{E}\left[Z^\delta\right] < \infty$ for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$. For $\rho, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ define the map*

$$h(\rho,\beta) := \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[XZ^\rho \exp\left(-\beta X - (1-\rho)Y\right)\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[Z^\rho \exp\left(-\beta X - (1-\rho)Y\right)\right]}. \tag{10.11}$$

Let $p \in (ess\ inf_{\mathbb{P}}[X], ess\ sup_{\mathbb{P}}[X])$. Then

i) For each $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists a unique $\beta(\rho)$ such that $h(\rho, \beta(\rho)) = p$.

ii) The map $\rho \mapsto \beta(\rho)$ is continuously differentiable on $\mathbb{R}$.

Remark 10.10. The integrability condition can be weakened on Z. For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, the map $\rho \mapsto \beta(\rho)$ will be in $C^1(a,b)$ if $\mathbb{E}\left[Z^{a-1}\right] < \infty$, $\mathbb{E}\left[Z^b\right] < \infty$.

Proof of Lemma 10.9. Let $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[Z^\rho] < \infty$, define a measure $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ via $d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}/d\mathbb{P} = Z^\rho / \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[Z^\rho]$. Given this, part *i)* follows from Lemma 10.7 applied to $\mathbb{P} = \tilde{\mathbb{P}}$, $X = h(Y_T)$, $Y = -(1-\rho)Y$ and noting that since Z is strictly positive, $\tilde{\mathbb{P}} \sim \mathbb{P}$.

As for part *ii)* by the Implicit Function Theorem [Rudin, 1976, Theorem 9.28], the continuous differentiability of $\beta(\rho)$ will follow if the function h is also continuously differentiable and such that $h_\beta \neq 0$. Furthermore, in this case, $\beta'(\rho) = -h_\rho / h_\beta|_{\rho,\beta(\rho)}$.

It is necessary to show the partial derivatives exist and are continuous and $h_\beta \neq 0$. With regards to h_β, by applying Lemma 4.4 as above, h_β exists and is strictly negative : indeed, h_β is given by

$$h_\beta(\rho,\beta) = -\mathrm{Var}^{\check{\mathbb{P}}}[X]; \qquad \frac{d\check{\mathbb{P}}}{d\mathbb{P}} = \frac{Z^\rho \exp\left(-\beta X - (1-\rho)Y\right)}{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[Z^\rho \exp\left(-\beta X - (1-\rho)Y\right)\right]}.$$

The continuity of h_β now follows by the dominated convergence theorem and the moment condition on Z. To see this, let $\rho, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and assume $\beta_m \to \beta$ and $\rho_m \to \rho$. Clearly, $Z^{\rho_m} e^{-\beta_m X - (1-\rho_m)Y}$ converges almost surely to $Z^\rho e^{-\beta X - (1-\rho)Y}$. And, for any small enough $\varepsilon > 0$, for large enough m

$$e^{-(|\beta|+1+2\varepsilon)K}\left(Z^{\rho-\varepsilon}1_{Z\geq 1} + Z^{\rho+\varepsilon}1_{Z<1}\right) \leq Z^{\rho_m} e^{-\beta_m X - (1-\rho_m)Y} \leq e^{(|\beta|+1+2\varepsilon)K}\left(Z^{\rho+\varepsilon}1_{Z\geq 1} + Z^{\rho-\varepsilon}1_{Z<1}\right).$$

Note that the lower bound is needed for the denominator in $d\check{\mathbb{P}}/d\mathbb{P}$. As for h_ρ, let $\rho, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varepsilon > 0$ be small and note that

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left|XZ^{\rho+\varepsilon}e^{-\beta X - (1-\rho-\varepsilon)Y} - XZ^\rho e^{-\beta X - (1-\rho)Y}\right| \leq K e^{(\beta+1)K} Z^\rho \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left|Z^\varepsilon e^{\varepsilon Y} - 1\right|.$$

For $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $\gamma > \varepsilon$

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left|e^{\varepsilon x} - 1\right| \leq \frac{1}{\gamma}(e^{\gamma x} - 1)1_{x>0} - x1_{x\leq 0} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma}e^{\gamma x} - x1_{x\leq 0}.$$

Plugging this in gives, for any $\gamma > 0$ and $\varepsilon < \gamma$,

$$\begin{aligned} Z^\rho \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left|Z^\varepsilon e^{\varepsilon Y} - 1\right| &\leq \frac{1}{\gamma} Z^\rho e^{\gamma(\log Z + Y)} - Z^\rho(\log Z + Y)1_{\log Z + Y \leq 0}, \\ &\leq \frac{e^{\gamma K}}{\gamma} Z^{\rho+\gamma} + Z^\rho\left(|\log(Z)| + K\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the moment condition on Z allows invocation of the dominated convergence theorem (note : in the equation for h, the denominator only differs from the numerator by the X term which is bounded), giving

$$h_\rho(\rho,\beta) = \mathrm{Cov}^{\check{\mathbb{P}}}\left[X, \log Z + Y\right].$$

The continuity of h_ρ follows by a similar calculation as for h_β, using the bounds on X, Y and the moment condition on Z to invoke the dominated convergence theorem.

□

References

Laurence Carassus and Miklós Rásonyi. Risk-averse asymptotics for reservation prices. *Annals of Finance*, 7:375–387, 2011. ISSN 1614-2446.

Laurence Carassus and Miklós Rásonyi. Convergence of utility indifference prices to the superreplication price: the whole real line case. *Acta Appl. Math.*, 96(1-3):119–135, 2007. ISSN 0167-8019.

René Carmona. *Indifference pricing.* Princeton Series in Financial Engineering. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2009. ISBN 978-0-691-13883-1. Theory and applications.

M.H.A. Davis. Option Pricing in Incomplete Markets. *Mathematics of Derivative Securities*, 1997.

Freddy Delbaen, Peter Grandits, Thorsten Rheinländer, Dominick Samperi, Martin Schweizer, and Christophe Stricker. Exponential hedging and entropic penalties. *Math. Finance*, 12(2):99–123, 2002. ISSN 0960-1627.

Amir Dembo and Ofer Zeitouni. *Large deviations techniques and applications*, volume 38 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York).* Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998. ISBN 0-387-98406-2.

H. Föllmer and W. Schachermayer. Asymptotic arbitrage and large deviations. *Math. Financ. Econ.*, 1(3-4):213–249, 2007. ISSN 1862-9679.

Hans Föllmer and Alexander Schied. *Stochastic finance*, volume 27 of *de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics.* Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, extended edition, 2004. ISBN 3-11-018346-3. An introduction in discrete time.

Christoph Frei and Martin Schweizer. Exponential utility indifference valuation in two Brownian settings with stochastic correlation. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 40(2):401–423, 2008. ISSN 0001-8678.

Christoph Frei and Martin Schweizer. Exponential utility indifference valuation in a general semimartingale model. In *Optimality and risk—modern trends in mathematical finance*, pages 49–86. Springer, Berlin, 2009.

Vicky Henderson. Valuation of claims on nontraded assets using utility maximization. *Math. Finance*, 12(4):351–373, 2002. ISSN 0960-1627.

Stewart D. Hodges and Anthony Neuberger. Optimal replication of contingent claims under transactions costs. 8:222–239, 1989.

Aytaç İlhan, Mattias Jonsson, and Ronnie Sircar. Optimal investment with derivative securities. *Finance Stoch.*, 9(4):585–595, 2005. ISSN 0949-2984.

Aytaç İlhan, Mattias Jonsson, and Ronnie Sircar. Portfolio optimization with derivatives and indifference pricing. In René Carmona, editor, *Indifference Pricing*, Princeton Series in Financial Engineering. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2009. Theory and applications.

Ioannis Karatzas and Steven E. Shreve. *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, volume 113 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1991. ISBN 0-387-97655-8.

Dmitry Kramkov and Mihai Sîrbu. Sensitivity analysis of utility-based prices and risk-tolerance wealth processes. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 16(4):2140–2194, 2006. ISSN 1050-5164.

Michael Monoyios. The minimal entropy measure and an Esscher transform in an incomplete market model. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 77(11):1070–1076, 2007. ISSN 0167-7152.

Marek Musiela and Thaleia Zariphopoulou. An example of indifference prices under exponential preferences. *Finance Stoch.*, 8(2):229–239, 2004. ISSN 0949-2984.

Mark P. Owen and Gordan Žitković. Optimal investment with an unbounded random endowment and utility-based pricing. *Math. Finance*, 19(1):129–159, 2009. ISSN 0960-1627.

Richard Rouge and Nicole El Karoui. Pricing via utility maximization and entropy. *Math. Finance*, 10(2):259–276, 2000. ISSN 0960-1627. INFORMS Applied Probability Conference (Ulm, 1999).

Walter Rudin. *Principles of mathematical analysis*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, third edition, 1976. International Series in Pure and Applied Mathematics.

Walter Schachermayer. Optimal investment in incomplete markets when wealth may become negative. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 11(3):694–734, 2001. ISSN 1050-5164.

Pietro Siorpaes. Optimal investment with stocks and derivatives. Preprint, 2010. URL `http://www.math.cmu.edu/~psiorpae/research.html`.

Michael Tehranchi. Explicit solutions of some utility maximization problems in incomplete markets. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 114(1):109–125, 2004. ISSN 0304-4149.

Carnegie Mellon University, Department of Mathematical Sciences, Wean Hall 6113, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA

E-mail address: `scottrob@andrew.cmu.edu`